



**Proceedings of the  
72nd ANNUAL CONVENTION**

**NCAA**

**ATLANTA, GEORGIA / JANUARY 11-13, 1978**

Proceedings  
of the  
72nd Annual  
Convention  
of the  
National Collegiate  
Athletic Association

Peachtree Plaza Hotel  
Atlanta, Georgia  
January 11-13, 1978





## THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

U.S. Highway 50 and Nall Avenue  
P.O. Box 1906  
Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66222  
913/384-3220

May 1978

NCAA, NCAA seal, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

## Table of Contents

### I. Register 1978

Administrative Organization .....	6
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Media .....	10

### II. Proceedings of the 72nd NCAA Convention

Opening Session	
1. Opening Remarks .....	26
2. Report of the Council .....	27
3. Report of the Committee on Memorial Resolutions .....	31
4. Additional Remarks .....	32
Division I Round Table .....	35
Division II Round Table .....	42
Division III Round Table .....	45
Honors Luncheon .....	47
General Round Table .....	65
Final Business Session	
5. Acceptance of Reports .....	86
6. Proposed Amendments	
Consent Package—Constitution .....	86
Consent Package—Bylaws .....	86
Amateurism—Broken-Time Payments .....	87
Professional Draft .....	87
Employment—Tennis .....	88
Athletic Awards .....	89
Athletic Awards .....	89
Travel Uniforms .....	89
Division I Membership Criteria .....	89 —
Continuation of Final Business Session	
7. Proposed Amendments	
Division I Membership Criteria .....	114 —
Resolution: Division I-AA Football .....	128
Multidivision Classification .....	128
Division II Criteria .....	128
Division II Criteria .....	129
Division III Criteria .....	130
Division III Criteria .....	131
Allied Divisional Membership .....	132
Multidivision Classification .....	133
Financial Aid—BEOG .....	133
Financial Aid—BEOG .....	135
BEOG Formula .....	136
Financial Aid Definition .....	136
Continuation of Final Business Session	
8. Proposed Amendments	
Financial Aid Definition .....	137
Exempted Players .....	137
Countable Player—Football .....	138

Determination of Financial Aid .....	138
Maximum Awards—Division I Baseball .....	142
Maximum Awards—Division I Track .....	143
Maximum Awards—Division I Fencing .....	143
Maximum Awards—Division I Gymnastics .....	144
Maximum Awards—Division I Ice Hockey .....	144
Maximum Awards—Division I Tennis .....	144
Maximum Awards—Division I Football .....	144
Maximum Awards—Division I Football .....	145
Maximum Awards—Division II Football .....	145
Exempted Players .....	146
Five-Year Rule .....	148
Five-Year Rule .....	150
Five-Year Rule .....	150
Olympic Tryouts and Competition .....	152
High School All-Star Games .....	152
Summer Baseball .....	154
Normal Progress .....	155
Eligibility—2,000 Rule .....	156
9. Report of the Committee on Committees .....	159
10. Recognition of Outgoing Council Members .....	159
11. Report of the Nominating Committee .....	159
Continuation of Final Business Session	
12. Proposed Amendments	
2,000 Rule/1,600 Rule .....	161
Seasons of Competition .....	163
Seasons of Competition .....	165
Hardship—Ice Hockey .....	167
Individual Eligibility Changes .....	167
Transfer Rule—Calendar Year .....	168
Transfer Rule—Calendar Year .....	169
Transfer—Junior College .....	169
Transfer Rules .....	170
Academic Year Interpretation .....	171
Transfer—Junior College .....	172
Transfer Rule—Division III .....	172
Transfer Rule—Division III .....	172
Recruiting Contacts .....	173
Recruiting Contacts .....	173
Recruiting Contacts .....	174
Campus Visits .....	174
Recruiting—Employment .....	175
Complimentary Ticket—Student Host .....	175
Campus Visit—Meal .....	175
Basketball Playing Season .....	176
Basketball Playing Season .....	176
Football Playing Season .....	177
Football Practice—Division III .....	178
Postseason Football Contests .....	178
Division II Women's Championships .....	179
Division II Ice Hockey .....	182

Enforcement Policies .....	182
Football Coaching Staff .....	185
Coaching Limitations—Recruiting .....	186
Coaching Staffs—Additional Teams .....	186
Coaching Staffs—Service Academies .....	186
Scouting Limitations .....	187
Scouting Limitations .....	187
Scouting Limitations .....	188
Scouting Limitations .....	188
Scouting Limitations .....	188
Postseason Football Contests .....	188
Foreign Tours .....	189
Resolution: Disasters .....	189
Coaching Limitations—Recruiting .....	189
Out-of-Season Practice .....	190
Application of Rules .....	190
Application of Rules .....	190
Playing Conference .....	190
Amendments .....	190
College All-Star Contests .....	191
Automatic Qualification .....	191
Television Committee .....	191
Television Committee .....	191
Television Exception .....	192
Resolution: Television Contracts .....	193
Medical Examinations .....	193

### III. Appendices

A. Legislative Proposals .....	A- 1
B. Revisions of Executive Regulations .....	A-100
C. Results of Roll-Call Vote .....	A-104
D. Convention Committees .....	A-106
E. Past and Future Convention Sites .....	A-108
F. Past and Present NCAA Officers .....	A-110

## 1977 NCAA Administrative Organization

### NCAA Officers

#### President

J. NEILS THOMPSON  
*Chairman, Intercollegiate Athletics for Men*  
 University of Texas  
 P.O. Box 7399  
 Austin, Texas 78712

#### Secretary-Treasurer

EDGAR A. SHERMAN  
*Director of Athletics*  
 Muskingum College  
 New Concord, Ohio 43762

#### Executive Director

WALTER BYERS  
 U.S. Highway 50 and Nall Avenue  
 P.O. Box 1906  
 Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66222

### NCAA Council

*The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA President and Secretary-Treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chairman and secretary, respectively. Eight members of the Council are the eight district vice-presidents, each of whom is elected for two years and may be immediately re-elected for one additional term. Eight vice-presidents-at-large are elected for terms of three years and may not be re-elected until three years have elapsed.*

*Term Expires*

- District 1 Vice-President*—Ross H. Smith ..... Jan. 1978  
 Professor; Director of Athletics  
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
 Box D, MIT Station  
 Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
- District 2 Vice-President*—Raymond J. Whispell ..... Jan. 1979  
 Professor of Physical Education; Director of Athletics  
 Muhlenberg College  
 Allentown, Pennsylvania 18104
- District 3 Vice-President*—Charley Scott ..... Jan. 1978  
 Associate Academic Vice-President  
 University of Alabama  
 P.O. Box 1933  
 University, Alabama 35486
- District 4 Vice-President*—Fred Picard ..... Jan. 1979  
 Professor of Economics  
 Ohio University  
 Athens, Ohio 45701
- District 5 Vice-President*—James Frank ..... Jan. 1978  
 President  
 Lincoln University  
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

## 1977 NCAA Administrative Organization

### Council (Continued)

- District 6 Vice-President*—Kenneth W. Herrick ..... Jan. 1979  
 M. J. Neeley School of Business  
 Texas Christian University  
 Fort Worth, Texas 76129
- District 7 Vice-President*—Harry E. Troxell ..... Jan. 1978  
 Professor of Wood Science and Technology  
 Colorado State University  
 Fort Collins, Colorado 80523
- District 8 Vice-President*—Edward S. Betz ..... Jan. 1979  
 Professor of Communication Arts  
 University of the Pacific  
 Stockton, California 95211
- Vice-President-at-Large*—Sherwood O. Berg ..... Jan. 1980  
 President  
 South Dakota State University  
 Brookings, South Dakota 57006
- Vice-President-at-Large*—Ernest C. Casale ..... Jan. 1978  
 Director of Athletics; Assistant Professor of Mathematics  
 Temple University  
 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
- Vice-President-at-Large*—Cecil N. Coleman ..... Jan. 1979  
 Director of Athletics  
 Assembly Hall #112  
 University of Illinois  
 Champaign, Illinois 61820
- Vice-President-at-Large*—John R. Eiler ..... Jan. 1978  
 Director of Athletics; Professor of Physical Education  
 East Stroudsburg State College  
 East Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania 18301
- Vice-President-at-Large*—Hubert Heitman Jr. .... Jan. 1978  
 Professor of Animal Science  
 University of California, Davis  
 Davis, California 95616
- Vice-President-at-Large*—Robert M. Strimer ..... Jan. 1978  
 Director of Athletics; Chairman, Department  
 of Physical Education  
 Ohio Wesleyan University  
 Delaware, Ohio 43015
- Vice-President-at-Large*—Herbert B. Thompson ..... Jan. 1980  
 Director of Athletics  
 Fisk University  
 17th Avenue North  
 Nashville, Tennessee 37203
- Vice-President-at-Large*—John L. Toner ..... Jan. 1980  
 Director of Athletics  
 University of Connecticut  
 Storrs, Connecticut 06268

## 1977 NCAA Administrative Organization

### NCAA Executive Committee

*The NCAA President and Secretary-Treasurer shall be ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The remaining eight members of the Committee are elected by the Council for a period of one year. At least one new member shall be elected each year. Date of first election is shown in parentheses.*

Stan Bates (Jan. 1970)

Commissioner  
Western Athletic Conference  
1515 Cleveland Place, Suite 300  
Denver, Colorado 80202

J. William Grice (Jan. 1977)

Chairman, Department of Physical Education;  
Director of Athletics  
Case Western Reserve University  
Adelbert Road  
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Robert C. James (Jan. 1976)

Commissioner  
Atlantic Coast Conference  
P.O. Box 6271, Summit Station  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27405

J. D. Morgan (Jan. 1977)

Director of Athletics  
University of California, Los Angeles  
405 Hilgard Avenue  
Los Angeles, California 90024

Seaver Peters (Jan. 1977)

Director of Athletics  
Dartmouth College  
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755

Earl M. Ramer (Jan. 1973)

Professor of Education; Chairman, Athletic Board  
13 Henson Hall  
University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

Joe L. Singleton (Jan. 1977)

Director of Athletics  
University of California, Davis  
c/o Hickey Gymnasium, Room 264  
Davis, California 95616

Edward S. Steitz (Jan. 1974)

Professor; Director of Athletics  
Springfield College  
Springfield, Massachusetts 01109

## 1977 NCAA Administrative Organization

### NCAA National Office

#### General Administration

Walter Byers, *Executive Director*

Louis J. Spry, *Controller*

James H. Wilkinson, *Assistant Executive Director*

Marjorie Fieber, *Business Manager*

#### Enforcement

William B. Hunt, *Assistant Executive Director*

S. David Berst, *Director of Enforcement*

Hale McMenamin, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*

Ronald J. Stratten, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*

James E. Delany, *Enforcement Representative*

Melvin D. Dodd, *Enforcement Representative*

Michael M. Gilleran, *Enforcement Representative*

Michael C. Mesh, *Enforcement Representative*

Robert J. Minnix, *Enforcement Representative*

Stephen R. Morgan, *Enforcement Representative*

Fannie B. Vaughan, *Administrative Assistant*

Thomas E. Yeager, *Enforcement Representative*

#### Events

Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Assistant Executive Director*

Jerry A. Miles, *Director of Events*

Ralph McFillen, *Assistant Director of Events*

Dennis L. Poppe, *Assistant Director of Events*

#### Public Relations

Thomas C. Hansen, *Assistant Executive Director*

David E. Cawood, *Director of Public Relations*

John T. Waters, *Director of Promotion*

C. Dennis Cryder, *Director of Productions*

Jim Van Valkenburg, *Director of Statistics*

Steve Boda, *Associate Director of Statistics*

Gregory L. Mauldin, *Administrative Assistant*

David Pickle, *NCAA News Editor*

James W. Shaffer, *Asst. Dir. of Public Relations and Promotion*

Shirley Whitacre, *Administrative Assistant*

Jules L. Winn, *Administrative Assistant*

James F. Wright, *Administrative Assistant*

Ron Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service*

888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019

#### Publishing

Ted C. Tow, *Assistant Executive Director*

Wallace I. Renfro, *Director of Publishing*

Maxine R. Alejos, *Circulation Manager*

Lavonne G. Anderson, *Publishing Production Manager*

Douglas D. Mead, *Publications Editor*

Dale M. Meggas, *Research Assistant*

David P. Seifert, *Publications Editor*

## 72nd ANNUAL CONVENTION DELEGATES AND VISITORS

### Active Member Institutions

#### District One

American International College: Milton J. Piepul  
 Amherst College: Peter Gooding  
 Assumption College: Andrew Laska  
 Bates College: Robert W. Hatch  
 Bentley College: Don Moorhead  
 Boston College: Mary Miller Carson, William J. Flynn, Rev. Joseph L. Shea  
 Boston State College: James P. Sullivan  
 Boston University: Richard G. Fecteau, John B. Simpson  
 Bowdoin College: Edmund L. Coombs  
 Brandeis University: Nicholas Rodis  
 Bridgeport, University of: Francis W. Poisson  
 Bridgewater State College: Harry Lehmann  
 Brown University: John Parry, Robert A. Seiple  
 Bryant College: Thomas J. Folliard  
 Central Connecticut State College: Lowell D. Lukas, William M. Moore  
 Clark University: Russ Granger, A. Dixie Walker  
 Colby College: Richard J. McGee  
 Connecticut, University of: Rita L. Custeau, John L. Toner  
 Connecticut College: Charles Luce  
 Dartmouth College: Alden H. Burnham, Seaver Peters  
 Eastern Connecticut State College: William P. Holowaty  
 Fairfield University: C. Donald Cook  
 Hartford, University of: Gordon McCullough  
 Harvard University: Eric Cutler, John P. Reardon Jr.  
 Holy Cross College: Ronald Perry  
 Keene State College: John L. Cramer, Leo Redfern  
 Lowell, University of: James Ciszek  
 Maine, University of, Orono: Harold S. Westerman  
 Massachusetts, University of: David Bischoff, Guy M. Lewis, Robert W. O'Connell  
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Jane Betts, Ross H. Smith  
 Merrimack College: Thom Lawler  
 Middlebury College: G. Thomas Lawson  
 New England College: George Hamilton  
 New Hampshire, University of: Lionel J. Carbonneau, Maynard C. Heckel, C. Robert Keesey, Andrew Mooradian  
 New Haven, University of: Joseph A. Machnik  
 North Adams State College: Joseph Zavattaro  
 Northeastern University: Robert Lyons, Joseph P. Zabitski  
 Norwich University: Barry W. Mynter  
 Providence College: Rev. Francis C. Duffy

Rhode Island, University of: Walter L. Barker, Ernie Calverley, Maurice Zarchen  
 Rhode Island College: William M. Baird, Donald P. Hardy, James Rubovits  
 St. Anselm's College: Edward Cannon, Brendan P. Donnelly  
 St. Michael's College: Edward P. Markey  
 Salem State College: William A. Gillis  
 Southern Connecticut State College: Raymond W. DeFrancesco, Lawrence Fitzgerald  
 Springfield College: Diane L. Potter, Edward S. Steitz  
 Trinity College: Karl Kurth Jr.  
 Tufts University: Rocco Carzo  
 Vermont, University of: Richard A. Farnham, Denis Lambert  
 Wesleyan University: Donald M. Russell  
 Western Connecticut State College: John A. Barlett Jr.  
 Westfield State College: F. Paul Bogan  
 Williams College: Robert R. Peck  
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Robert W. Pritchard  
 Worcester State College: Robert A. Devlin  
 Yale University: James G. Holgate, Ken MacKenzie

#### District Two

Adelphi University: Ronald Bazil  
 Albany, State University of New York: Robert M. Ford  
 Allegheny College: Harold N. McElhaney  
 American University: Raymond W. Murphy Jr.  
 Bernard M. Baruch College: Alfred R. Peredo  
 Bethany College: David M. Hutter  
 Binghamton, State University of New York: Robert D. Kreidler  
 Bloomsburg State College: H. Cecil Turberville Jr., John L. Walker  
 Brockport, State University College: Charles L. Crawford  
 Brooklyn College: Joseph A. Margolis  
 Bucknell University: Robert A. Latour  
 Buffalo, State University College: Fred J. Hartrick, Howard B. MacAdam  
 Buffalo, State University of New York: John Medige, Edwin D. Muto  
 C. W. Post College: Jim Colclough  
 Canisius College: Daniel P. Starr  
 Carnegie-Mellon University: James E. Banner  
 Catholic University: J. Brian McCall  
 Cheyney State College: Edwin W. Lawrence  
 Clarion State College: Frank Lignelli  
 Clarkson College of Technology: F. William Fiesinger  
 Colgate University: Robert Deming, Fred Dunlap  
 Columbia University: Alvin R. Paul  
 Cornell University: Dick Schultz  
 Cortland, State University College: Roger I. Robinson, Robert Weber  
 Delaware, University of: Scotty Duncan, David M. Nelson  
 Delaware State College: W. Richard Wynder  
 Delaware Valley College: Alvin J. Wilson  
 Dickinson College: David B. Eavenson

Drew University: John Reeves  
 Drexel University: John Semanik, Mary Semanik  
 Duquesne University: John Manning  
 East Stroudsburg State College: John R. Eiler, Clyde H. Witman  
 Edinboro State College: Allan W. Hall  
 Elizabethtown College: John M. Tulley  
 Elmira College: Paul H. Brand  
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Robert T. Shields  
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Walter Marusyn, Ellen McEwen, Robert V. Metz  
 Fordham University: Peter A. Carlesimo, David Rice  
 Franklin and Marshall University: William A. Marshall  
 Fredonia, State University College: Patrick R. Damore, Everett Phillips  
 Gannon College: Howard Elwell  
 Geneseo, State University College: Daniel T. Mullin, Robert F. Riedel  
 George Mason University: Raymond H. Spuhler  
 George Washington University: Edward Caress, Ribert K. Faris  
 Georgetown University: Jesse Mann, Francis X. Rienzo  
 Gettysburg College: Eugene M. Haas  
 Glassboro State College: Michael Briglia, Maurice G. Verbeke  
 Hamilton College: Eugene M. Long  
 Hampton Institute: Walter L. Lovett, Samuel E. Massenberg  
 Hartwick College: Thomas H. Greene  
 Haverford College: Dana W. Swan  
 Hobart College: William C. Stiles  
 Hofstra University: Robert M. Getchell  
 Howard University: Henry Jones, Leo F. Miles, Sondra Norrell  
 Hunter College: Anthony Scolnick  
 Indiana University (Pa.): John Chellman, Herman L. Sledzik, Robert C. Wilburn  
 Iona College: James McDermott  
 Ithaca College: Charles A. Kerr  
 John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Wallace M. Pina  
 Lafayette College: Olav B. Kollevoll  
 LaSalle College: Bill Bradshaw, Thomas N. McCarthy, Kathleen Wear  
 Lebanon Valley College: Gerald Petroses  
 Lehigh University: William B. Leckonby  
 LeMoyne College: Thomas J. Niland Jr.  
 Lock Haven State College: Charles A. Eberle  
 Long Island University: Jerry Donner  
 Loyola College: Thomas O'Connor  
 Lycoming College: James R. Jose  
 Manhattan College: Kenneth A. Norton  
 Marist College: Ron Petro  
 Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: James Mohr, E. Richard Watts Jr.  
 Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Joel C. Mack, Nelson E. Townsend  
 Medgar Evers College: Paul Bobb  
 Millersville State College: Lawrence A. McDermott  
 Monmouth College: William T. Boylan

Montclair State College: William P. Dioguardi  
 Moravian College: Rocco J. Calvo  
 Morgan State University: Earl Banks, Kenneth F. Jerkins  
 Muhlenberg College: Raymond J. Whispell  
 New Jersey Institute of Technology: Robert F. Swanson  
 New York, City College of: Richard Zerneck  
 New York Institute of Technology: Henry Jacobsohn  
 New York University: Daniel E. Quilty  
 Niagara University: Paul M. Smith  
 Oswego, State University College: John L. Spring  
 Pace University: Peter X. Finnerty  
 Pennsylvania, University of: Ferdinand A. Geiger, Reid I. Howard, Connie Van Housen  
 Pennsylvania State University: John J. Coyle, Edward M. Czekaj, Richard J. Lucas, Joseph V. Paterno, Robert J. Scannell  
 Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Harry Pure  
 Pittsburgh, University of, Johnstown: C. Edward Sherlock  
 Pittsburgh, University of: John O. Bolvin, Edward E. Bozik, Walter P. Cummins, Casimir J. Myslinski  
 Princeton University: Royce N. Flippin Jr.  
 Queens College: Richard Wettan  
 Ramapo College: Robert N. Hartman  
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte, Alan H. Goodyear  
 Rider College: John B. Carpenter  
 Robert Morris College: Kenneth W. Mease, Charles L. Sewall, Jon A. Shank  
 Rochester, University of: David R. Ocorr  
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Frederick E. Gruninger, Donald Heilman, Fred C. Simonson  
 Rutgers University, Newark: Steven Senko, Gene A. Vincenti  
 St. Bonaventure University: Lawrence J. Weise  
 St. Francis College (N.Y.): Carlo Tramontozzi  
 St. Francis College (Pa.): I. Vincent Davis  
 St. John's University: John W. Kaiser  
 St. Joseph's College: Don J. DiJulia  
 St. Lawrence University: Robert J. Sheldon  
 St. Peter's College: John B. Wilson  
 Salisbury State College: Norman C. Crawford  
 Seton Hall University: Richard P. Adinero, Robert T. Conley, Richard J. Regan  
 Scranton, University of: Gary N. Wodder  
 Shippensburg State College: John Hubley  
 Slippery Rock State College: William C. Meise, Robert E. Raymond  
 Stony Brook, State University College: John W. Ramsey  
 Swarthmore College: Lewis H. Elverson  
 Syracuse University: David H. Bennett, Lester H. Dye, Joe Gallagher, Richard Gibney, Joseph Szombathy  
 Temple University: Ernest C. Casale  
 Towson State University: Thomas O. Meinhardt  
 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Capt. William T. Lai  
 U.S. Military Academy: Raymond P. Murphy, Brig. Gen. Frederick A. Smith



U.S. Naval Academy: Capt. J. O. Coppedge, Carl F. Ullrich  
 Ursinus College: Robert R. Davidson  
 Villanova University: Ted Aceto  
 Wagner College: Lawrence J. Geraciotti  
 West Chester State College: Dennis D. Bell, Robert W. Reese, Edwin L. Youmans  
 West Virginia University: Marylou R. Barnes, Leland E. Byrd  
 Widener College: William B. Manlove Jr.  
 William Paterson College: Arthur Easton

### District Three

Alabama, University of: Sam D. Bailey, Jeff Coleman, Charley Scott, Richard Thigpen  
 Alabama A&M University: Joseph Henderson, James H. Hicks  
 Alabama State University: Tommy L. Frederick  
 Albany State College: Wilburn A. Campbell Jr.  
 Appalachian State University: C. H. Gilstrap, James F. Jones, Herbert W. Wey  
 Armstrong State College: Roy J. Sims  
 Auburn University: Wilford S. Bailey, Lee R. Hayley, Kenny Howard, Harry M. Philpot  
 Augusta College: George A. Christenberry, Roscoe Williams  
 Austin Peay State University: Leon Bibb, Joe Brown  
 Averett College: Joyce H. Weiblen  
 Baptist College: Howard Bagwell  
 Bellarmine College: David P. O'Toole  
 Bethune-Cookman College: Lloyd C. Johnson  
 Bridgewater College: James A. Reedy  
 Campbell College: Wendell L. Carr, Bill Martin  
 Centre College: Herbert W. McGuire  
 Citadel: Maj. Gen. James A. Grimsley, Lt. Col. William L. Harris, Lt. Gen. George M. Seignious, Edward L. Teague  
 Clark College: Jesse McClardy  
 Clemson University: Bill McLellan, Kenneth N. Vickery  
 Columbus College: Billy D. McGee  
 Davidson College: T. C. Price Zimmermann  
 Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, Bradford W. Hovious, Kent Wyatt  
 District of Columbia, University of: Grady C. Bell, Hanai H. Omar, Oliver M. Thompson  
 Duke University: Tom Butters, Edwin Cady  
 East Carolina University: William E. Cain, Clifton G. Moore  
 East Tennessee State University: J. Madison Brooks, Arthur H. DeRosier Jr., David A. Lipp, William H. McCarthy, Janice C. Shelton  
 Eastern Kentucky University: Donald G. Combs  
 Elizabeth City State University: Thomas L. Caldwell  
 Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University: Edward G. Wurzbach  
 Emory University: Clyde Partin  
 Fisk University: John C. Martin, Herbert B. Thompson  
 Florida, University of: Bill Carr, Mandell Glicksberg, S. Ray Graves

Florida A&M University: Bishop Holifield, Charles U. Smith, Walter L. Smith, Hansel E. Tookes  
 Florida International University: Anthony Shershin, Tom H. Wonderling  
 Florida Southern College: Robert A. Davis  
 Florida State University: Richard M. Baker, John D. Bridgers, Bernard F. Sliger  
 Florida Technological University: John T. O'Leary, John Powell  
 Fort Valley State College: James E. Hawkins  
 Furman University: Francis W. Bonner, John E. Johns, John C. West  
 Georgia, University of: Fred C. Davison, Vince Dooley, Joel Eaves, Reid Parker  
 Georgia Institute of Technology: Joseph M. Pettit, William M. Sangster, Jack Thompson, Douglas W. Weaver  
 Georgia Southern College: George A. Cook, William L. Cook  
 Georgia State University: David Ewert  
 Hampden-Sydney College: J. Stokeley Fulton  
 Jacksonville State University: Jerry N. Cole  
 Jacksonville University: Judson B. Harris Jr., Robert H. Spiro  
 James Madison University: William E. Callahan, Ronald E. Carrier, Dean Ehlers  
 Johns Hopkins University: Robert H. Scott  
 Johnson C. Smith University: Edward C. McGirt  
 Kentucky, University of: Cliff Hagan, William L. Matthews Jr.  
 Kentucky State University: Ralph E. Burns, William Exum  
 Livingston University: Jim Pate  
 Livingstone College: Frederick D. Ponder  
 Louisiana State University: Lawrence R. Daniel Jr., Carl Maddox  
 Louisville, University of: Dave Hart, Burt L. Monroe Jr.  
 Lynchburg College: William H. Schellenberger  
 Marshall University: Olen E. Jones Jr., Joseph H. McMullen, Harold L. Willey  
 Maryland, University of, College Park: Robert L. Gluckstern, James H. Kehoe Jr., Russ Potts, Charles A. Taff  
 Maryville College: William F. Henry Jr.  
 Memphis State University: Chester J. Doll, Ford Haynes Jr., Billy J. Murphy  
 Mercer University: Jack L. Pigott  
 Miami, University of: Peter R. Elliott  
 Middle Tennessee State University: Lynn Haston, Charles M. Murphy, M. G. Scarlett  
 Miles College: T. J. Knox  
 Millsaps College: Harper Davis  
 Mississippi, University of: Warner Alford, Porter L. Fortune Jr., Richard E. Keye, John H. Vaught  
 Mississippi College: John W. Legg, John M. Williams  
 Mississippi State University: Alan Jones, Bob Tyler  
 Morehead State University: G. E. Moran Jr.  
 Morris Brown College: William T. Greene, Charles Hardnett  
 Murray State University: Johnny Reagan  
 New Orleans, University of: Alfred E. Weidie

Nicholls State University: Raymond E. Didier, Vernon F. Galliano  
 Norfolk State College: William L. Archie  
 North Alabama, University of: David Brown, Gerald L. Crawford, Wayne Grubb  
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Moyer G. Smith  
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: Larry C. Bostian, Thomas C. Turner  
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: Wayne Ladd, James R. Swiggett  
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: William J. Brooks  
 North Carolina A&T State University: Quiester Craig, Calvin C. Irvin, Albert E. Smith  
 North Carolina Central University: Joseph S. Parker, A. M. Rivera, Francis A. Silva, Dallas Simmons  
 North Carolina State University: Robert S. Bryan, Willis R. Casey, Joab L. Thomas, Frank Weedon  
 Northern Kentucky University: Lonnie J. Davis  
 Oglethorpe University: Manning M. Pattillo  
 Old Dominion University: James Jarrett, Alfred B. Rollins Jr.  
 Pembroke State University: Lacey E. Gane, Raymond B. Pennington  
 Randolph-Macon College: Ted Keller  
 Richmond, University of: Charles S. Boone, E. Sherman Grable  
 Roanoke College: Paul S. Griffin, Thomas J. Martin  
 Rollins College: Joseph Justice  
 St. Andrews Presbyterian College: Julian L. Smith  
 St. Leo College: Norman D. Kaye  
 St. Paul's College: Joseph E. Thompson  
 Samford University: H. Evan Zeiger  
 South, University of the: Walter Bryant Jr.  
 South Alabama, University of: James Boyd, Melvin A. Lucas  
 South Carolina, University of: James A. Carlen, William F. Putnam  
 South Carolina State College: Milton D. Hunter, Roy J. Isabel, Victor E. Kerr  
 South Florida, University of: Richard T. Bowers, Travis J. Northcutt Jr.  
 Southeastern Louisiana University: Robert C. Brown, Leo P. Jones  
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Roland H. Dale, J. Lloyd Milam  
 Southern University, New Orleans: Artis M. Davenport II  
 Southwestern College: Dick Thornton  
 Stetson University: Pope A. Duncan, Glenn N. Wilkes  
 Tampa, University of: Robert M. Birrenkott  
 Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: James E. Drinnon Jr., Charles M. Temple, Harold B. Wilkes  
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: John Majors, Henry Lee Parker, Earl M. Ramer, George R. Woodruff  
 Tennessee, University of, Martin: Robert L. Carroll, Carl Seale  
 Tennessee State University: Sterlin N. Adams, George A. Pruitt, Samuel R. Whitmon  
 Tennessee Technological University: Frank Alexander, David L. Larmore, Don Wade  
 Troy State University: Robert E. Stewart  
 Tulane University: James T. Rogers, Hindman Wall

Tuskegee Institute: Howard Davis  
 Valdosta State College: Gary L. Bass, James G. Connell Jr., William C. Grant  
 Vanderbilt University: Alexander Heard, Rob Roy Purdy, Clayton Stapleton  
 Virginia, University of: Eugene F. Corrigan, James O. West, D. Alan Williams  
 Virginia Commonwealth University: Lewis Mills  
 Virginia Military Institute: Lt. Gen. Richard L. Irby, Tom Joynes  
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: Wilson B. Bell, William E. Lavery  
 Virginia State College: William M. Bennett, Claud Flythe  
 Wake Forest University: Gene E. Hooks, John W. Sawyer  
 Washington and Lee University: William D. McHenry  
 Washington College: Edward L. Athey  
 Western Carolina University: Jim T. Hamilton, Robert Waters  
 Western Kentucky University: John D. Minton, John Oldham  
 William and Mary, College of: Lawrence S. Beckhouse, Bernard L. Carnevale, Thomas A. Graves Jr.

#### District Four

Akron, University of: Gordon K. Larson  
 Alma College: Charles A. Gray  
 Ashland College: Fred M. Martinelli, Robert L. Wendling  
 Augustana College: Vincent C. Lundeen  
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Lee J. Tressel  
 Ball State University: John E. Reno, George E. Swafford, H. W. Wallace  
 Bowling Green State University: Don A. Cunningham, Carl W. Hallberg, Jim Krone, Richard A. Young  
 Butler University: Joseph M. Nygaard, William L. Sylvester  
 Calvin College: David B. Tuuk  
 Case Western Reserve University: J. William Grice  
 Central Michigan University: Harold Abel, Theodore Kjolhede, Frank Koenig, Lester H. Serier  
 Central State University: Lionel H. Newsom, Gerald E. Williams, Lu D. Wims  
 Chicago, University of: Patricia Kirby, Mary Jean Mulvaney  
 Chicago State University: Gerald M. Butler  
 Cincinnati, University of: William F. Jenike, Gordon S. Skinner  
 Cleveland State University: Robert F. Busbey, Merle J. Levin  
 Dayton, University of: Thomas J. Frericks, Alden E. Ray  
 Denison University: LeRoy S. Seils  
 DePaul University: Eugene P. Sullivan  
 DePauw University: Robert D. Loring  
 Detroit, University of: Dale Tucker, Dick Vitale  
 Eastern Illinois University: Jimmie L. Franklin, Mike Mullally  
 Eastern Michigan University: Alex Agase, George W. Linn  
 Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, Robert Knott, Thornton Patberg  
 Ferris State College: Dean Davenport, Robert L. Ewigleben, Herbert D. Peterson  
 Grand Valley State Colleges: George M. MacDonald



Hamline University: Richard R. Mulkern  
 Heidelberg College: James Getz  
 Hope College: Gordon M. Brewer  
 Illinois, University of, Champaign: Cecil N. Coleman, William A. Ferguson, William P. Gerberding, Richard P. Tamburo  
 Illinois, University of, Chicago: William Roetzheim, Mary Kay Walsh, Richard Ward  
 Illinois State University: Twyman Jones, Laurie Mabry, Warren H. P. Schminkel  
 Indiana Central University: Bill Bless, Robert Brooker  
 Indiana State University, Evansville: Donald D. Bennett, Charles J. Bertram  
 Indiana State University, Terre Haute: Jerry Huntsman, John C. Jessell, Richard G. Landini  
 Indiana University: Chris C. Dal Sasso, Paul F. Dietzel, Ralph N. Floyd, Dan W. Miller  
 Iowa, University of: Chalmers W. Elliott, Gary Kurdelmeier, Robert F. Ray  
 Kalamazoo College: Rolla L. Anderson  
 Kent State University: Donald E. Dufek, Robert Treichler  
 Kenyon College: Philip J. Morse  
 Lake Superior State College: Ronald R. Cooper  
 Lawrence University: Ronald D. Roberts  
 Loyola University: Rev. John E. Reilly  
 Macalester College: Ralph Lundeen  
 Marietta College: Joe W. McDaniel  
 Marquette University: Marc F. Greisbach  
 Miami University: Charles Heimsch, Richard G. Shrider, Phillip R. Shriver  
 Michigan, University of: Donald B. Canham, Marcus L. Plant  
 Michigan State University: John A. Fuzak, Joseph L. Kearney  
 Michigan Technological University: K. Ross Johnson, Ted Kearly  
 Millikin University: Merle W. Chapman  
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Ralph A. Romano  
 Minnesota, University of, Minneapolis: Vivian Barfield, Julie Carson, Gary Engstrand, Robert J. Geary, Paul R. Giel, Dr. Merle K. Loken, Robert A. Stein  
 Minnesota, University of, Morris: Alan I. Molde  
 Moorhead State University: Ross Fortier  
 Muskingum College: Rudy Gerlach, Edgar A. Sherman  
 Northern Illinois University: Robert J. Brigham, Richard J. Nelson, Albert R. Pender  
 Northern Michigan University: Gil Canale, R. Thomas Peters Jr.  
 Northwestern University: Robert Kurz, Laurence H. Nobles, John Pont  
 Notre Dame, University of: Rev. Edmund P. Joyce, Edward W. Krause, Col. John Stephens  
 Oakland University: Corey Van Fleet, Glenn A. Jackson  
 Ohio Northern University: Marvin V. English  
 Ohio State University: Hugh D. Hindman, James L. Jones, Harold Shechter

Ohio University: Fred Picard, Charles Ping, William D. Rohr  
 Ohio Wesleyan: Richard D. Gordin, Robert M. Strimer  
 Otterbein College: Elmer N. Yoest  
 Principia College: James B. Crafton  
 Purdue University: Buford H. Byers, George S. King Jr., Carol Mertler, Roy L. Whistler  
 Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology: Joe Touchton  
 St. Cloud State University: J. F. Stanek  
 St. Thomas, College of: Frank Mach  
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Eldon M. Bigham  
 Toledo, University of: Glen R. Driscoll, Vernon M. Smith, John W. Stoepler  
 Valparaiso University: Norman Amundsen, Richard P. Koenig  
 Wabash College: Robert L. Henry  
 Wayne State University: Chalmer G. Hixson, Joel G. Mason  
 Western Illinois University: Bruce H. Carpenter, James E. McKinney, Gil Peterson  
 Western Michigan University: John T. Bernhard, Robert W. Hannah, Joseph T. Hoy, Christine Hoyles, Leo Vander Beek  
 Wheaton College: Jack Swartz  
 Wilmington College: Bill Ramseyer  
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Bruce A. Grimes  
 Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Otto Breitenbach, Frank J. Remington  
 Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Joseph Chang, James F. Harding, Ernest Spaight  
 Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: James J. Flood  
 Wisconsin, University of, Parkside: Wayne E. Dannehl  
 Wittenberg University: Everett H. Bush  
 Wright State University: Gordon L. Wise  
 Xavier University: James J. McCafferty  
 Youngstown State University: Paul V. Amodio

#### District Five

Bradley University: Orville Northdurft, Charles K. Orsborn  
 Buena Vista College: Jim Hershberger  
 Central College: Ronald Schipper, Kenneth J. Weller  
 Central Missouri State University: Warren C. Lovinger  
 Central State University: Charles W. Murdock  
 Colorado, University of: William H. Baughn, Edwin B. Crowder  
 Concordia College: Carl Everts  
 Creighton University: James R. Doyle, Dan Offenburger  
 Drake University: Phyllis Howlett, Robert D. Karnes, Wilbur C. Miller, Jack Wallace  
 Iowa State University: John P. Mahlstede, Louis G. McCullough  
 Kansas, University of: Mike Fisher, J. Hammond McNish, Jerry Waugh  
 Kansas State University: John Graham, John A. Jermier, Robert R. Snell  
 Lincoln University: James Frank, Dwight T. Reed  
 Luther College: Gretchen Brockmeyer, Edsel K. Schweizer  
 Mankato State University: James R. Otto

Missouri, University of, Columbia: Walter C. Daniel, Henry T. Lowe  
 Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Robert Markland  
 Morningside College: Lowell A. Brockman  
 Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Keith L. Broman, Don Bryant  
 Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Ronald Beer, Don Leahy  
 Nebraska Wesleyan University: Arthur C. Nicolai  
 New Mexico State University: Keith Colson, Carl R. Hall  
 North Dakota, University of: Carl R. Miller, George W. Schubert, Helen Smiley  
 North Dakota State University: Ade L. Sponberg  
 Northern Iowa, University of: R. C. Johnson, Stan Sheriff  
 Northwest Missouri State University: Mike Hunter  
 Oklahoma, University of: Daniel G. Gibbens, Wade H. Walker  
 Oklahoma City University: Paul N. Hansen  
 Oklahoma State University: Ray E. Chapel  
 Oral Roberts University: Robert T. Brooks, Jack Wallace  
 St. Louis University: J. Richard McDonald  
 South Dakota, University of: Bernard F. Cooper  
 South Dakota State University: Sherwood O. Berg, Harry L. Forsyth, Mylo A. Hellickson, Stanley J. Marshall  
 Southeast Missouri State University: Robert Leestamper, A. R. Meyer, Russ Sloan  
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: Warren W. Brandt, W. D. Klimstra, George R. Mace, Gale Sayers  
 Southwest Missouri State University: Duane G. Meyer, Aldo A. Sebben  
 Tulsa, University of: John P. Dratz, Emery C. Turner, J. Paschal Twyman  
 West Texas State University: Jack M. Bullock, Richard E. Dietl  
 Wichita State University: Martin M. Perline

#### District Six

Alcorn State University: Marino H. Casem, Norris A. Edney  
 Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: J. Frank Broyles, Albert M. Witte  
 Arkansas, University of, Pine Bluff: Lennis V. Coleman  
 Arkansas State University: Sam R. Gennuso, Ross J. Pritchard, R. Dean Pryor  
 Baylor University: Edwin P. Horner, Jack C. Patterson  
 Bishop College: Dwight H. Fisher  
 Centenary College: David E. Thomas  
 Grambling State University: Joseph B. Johnson, Edward G. Robinson  
 Hardin-Simmons University: William O. Beazley  
 Houston, University of: Harry H. Fouke, Michael T. Johnson, Jerome M. Peschke  
 Houston Baptist University: Ed S. Billings, William B. Crittenden  
 Jackson State University: Walter Reed  
 Lamar University: Ed Eveland, Belle Mead Holm, James B. Higgins  
 Louisiana Tech University: Maxie T. Lambright, Harold J. Smolinski, F. Jay Taylor  
 McNeese State University: Jack V. Doland, Charles W. Sparks  
 Mississippi Valley State University: Nathaniel Bocclair, Ernest A. Boykins Jr., Davis Weathersby

North Texas State University: Roy Bushy, John R. Carrell, Hayden Fry, William A. Miller  
 Northeast Louisiana University: John David Crow, Dwight D. Vines  
 Northwestern State University: Dan B. Carr, George E. Doherty  
 Pan American University: John W. Hook  
 Rice University: James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman, August Erfurth, Homer C. Rice  
 Southern Methodist University: N. R. Davis, Michael Harvey  
 Southern University, Baton Rouge: Emory W. Hines  
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Gerard St. Martin, Toby Warren  
 Texas, University of, Arlington: Emory D. Estes, Wendell H. Nedderman, William E. Reeves  
 Texas, University of, Austin: Bud Lasby, Darrell K. Royal, J. Neils Thompson  
 Texas A&M University: James Bond, Kay Don, Wally Groff, Charles H. Samson Jr., Marvin Tate  
 Texas Christian University: Kenneth W. Herrick, L. C. White, Frank Windegger  
 Texas Southern University: William Glosson  
 Texas Tech University: John Cobb, Frank W. Elliott, J. T. King

#### District Seven

Arizona, University of: Louis A. Myers, David H. Strack  
 Arizona State University: Robert L. Knox, V. Alonzo Metcalf, John Wadas  
 Boise State University: Norman F. Dahm, Lyle H. Smith  
 Brigham Young University: Clayne R. Jensen, Glen Tuckett  
 Colorado College: Raymond O. Werner  
 Colorado School of Mines: R. Bruce Allison, John A. Hogan  
 Colorado State University: Thurman F. McGraw, Harry E. Troxell  
 Denver, University of: Burton F. Brody, Ronald J. Oyer  
 Gonzaga University: Larry Koentopp  
 Idaho, University of: Roland O. Byers, John Ikeda  
 Idaho State University: Darold H. Chambers, Milton W. Holt  
 Montana, University of: Charles A. Bryan, Harley W. Lewis  
 Montana State University: Edward L. Hanson, Tom Parac  
 New Mexico, University of: William E. Davis, Marvin D. Johnson, Lavon McDonald, Ike Singer  
 Northern Arizona University: T. H. Anderson, Lyle L. Mullens  
 Northern Colorado, University of: Donald Chaloupka, Joe Lindahl, Arthur R. Reynolds  
 Regis College: Clarence H. Kellogg  
 Texas, University of, El Paso: Jim Bowden, Richard W. Burns  
 U.S. Air Force Academy: Col. John J. Chune, Col. Philip J. Erdle, Col. Thomas L. Moore  
 Utah, University of: Arnie Ferrin, James R. Jack, Dr. Clifford C. Snyder  
 Utah State University: Ladell Andersen, Norman B. Jones, Richard M. Swenson  
 Weber State University: James R. Foulger, Milton C. Mecham, Gary Crompton

Wyoming, University of: Joseph R. Geraud, George C. McCarty,  
William J. Young

#### **District Eight**

Bakersfield, California State College: Rudy Carvajal, Richard W. Graves, George B. Hibbard  
California, University of, Berkeley: David L. Maggard, Robert F. Steidel Jr.  
California, University of, Davis: Hubert Heitman Jr., Joe L. Singleton  
California, University of, Irvine: Linda B. Dempsay, Robert S. Lawrence  
California, University of, Los Angeles: Douglas S. Hobbs, Judy Holland, J. D. Morgan  
California, University of, Riverside: Sue Gozansky, Dwain Lewis  
California, University of, Santa Barbara: Edward E. Birch, Alice Henry, Albert E. Negratti  
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: Victor A. Buccola, Fred L. Clogston, Evelyn I. Pellaton  
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Barry A. Knight, Hugh O. LaBounty Jr., Donald Warhurst  
Chaminade University: Mike Vasconcellos  
Chapman College: Robert H. Pomeroy  
Chico, California State University: Rex R. Grossart  
Claremont Men's-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: Bill Arce  
Eastern Washington University: Jerry Martin  
Fresno, California State University: Allen Agnew, Norman A. Baxter, J. Gene Bourdet  
Fullerton, California State University: Neale R. Stoner, Andrew F. Montana, L. Donald Shields  
Hawaii, University of: Daniel Ghormley, Ray Nagel  
Hayward, California State University: George H. Peterson  
Humboldt State University: Donald G. Clancy  
Long Beach, California State University: Stephen Horn, Perry C. Moore, John W. Shainline  
Los Angeles, California State University: Charles L. Clark, John W. Hermann, Joan D. Johnson  
Loyola Marymount University: Richard J. Baker  
Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Robert E. Glennen, Bill Ireland  
Nevada, University of, Reno: Max Milam, Richard M. Trachok, William Wallace  
Northridge, California State University: Glenn W. Arnett, Sam Wunningham  
Oregon, University of: Wendell M. Basye, John Caine  
Oregon State University: Dee G. Andros, John R. Davis  
Pacific, University of the: Edward S. Betz, Cedric W. Dempsey  
Pepperdine University: Bob Thomas, Wayne Wright  
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Edward W. Malan  
Portland, University of: Joseph A. Etzel  
Portland State University: A. Scott Durdan, Roy L. Love  
Sacramento, California State University: J. Michael Bossert, Stanley V. Wright  
St. Mary's College: Donald J. McKillip

San Diego, University of: Thomas F. Burke  
San Diego State University: O. Kenneth Karr Jr., James G. Malik  
San Francisco, University of: Philip P. Callaghan  
San Francisco State University: Paul Rundell  
San Jose State University: John H. Bunzel, Robert W. Murphy, Richard Post  
Santa Clara, University of: George P. Malley  
Seattle Pacific University: William Rosenberger  
Seattle University: Edward J. O'Brien  
Southern California, University of: E. John Larsen, Richard H. Perry  
Stanford University: John W. Harbaugh, Richard W. Lyman, John H. Ruetz  
Washington, University of: Milo R. Lude, Harry M. Cross  
Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Sam Jankovich, Glenn Terrell

#### **Associate Members**

Alabama, University of, Birmingham: B. Gene Bartow, Bob Polk, Jerry D. Young  
Miami-Dade Community College, South: Howard R. Hohman  
Texas, University of, Dallas: Willie L. Davis

#### **Allied Members**

Atlantic Coast Conference: Robert C. James  
Big Eight Conference: Charles M. Neinas, Richard D. Martin  
Big Sky Conference: Steve Belko  
Big Ten Conference: Wayne Duke, John D. Dewey, Charles D. Henry  
California Collegiate Athletic Association: Lew Comer  
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Bob Moorman  
East Coast Conference: Ernest C. Casale  
Eastern College Athletic Conference: Robert M. Whitelaw, George R. Bisacca, Clayton W. Chapman  
Far Western Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Ervin C. Delman  
\*Indiana Collegiate Conference: John J. Hinga  
Ivy Group: James M. Litvack  
Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference: Lawrence K. Albus  
Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Albert L. Deal  
Mid-American Athletic Conference: Fred Jacoby  
Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: David B. Eavenson  
Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ron Roberts  
Missouri Valley Conference: A. M. Holmes  
New Jersey State College Athletic Conference: William P. Dioguardi  
North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: R. D. Halford  
Ohio Athletic Conference: Michael J. Cleary  
Ohio Valley Conference: Robert Vanatta  
Pacific Coast Athletic Association: Jesse T. Hill  
Pacific-8 Conference: Wiles Hallock, G. David Price  
Southeastern Conference: H. Boyd McWhorter, Elmore Hudgins, C. W. Ingram  
\*Nonvoting

Southern Conference: Kenneth G. Germann  
 Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: George H. Hobson  
 Southland Conference: Dick Oliver  
 Southwest Athletic Conference: Cliff Speegle, Hal Lahar  
 Southwestern Athletic Conference: Norris A. Edney  
 Sun Belt Conference: Victor Bubas  
 West Coast Athletic Conference: Jerry Wyness  
 Western Athletic Conference: Stan Bates  
 Yankee Conference: Andrew T. Mooradian

### **Affiliated Members**

American College Health Association: V. Arthur Stevens  
 American Football Coaches Association: Ben Martin, David Maurer,  
 Harold Raymond  
 National Association of Basketball Coaches: Joseph R. Vancisin  
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J.  
 Cleary  
 National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Jimmie McDowell  
 State of Louisiana Board of Trustees: Dewey H. Carrier Jr., Gordon  
 Flory, J. Y. Foreman, Irwin A. Sibille

### **Visitors**

American Council on Education: Fay Biles, James R. Spence  
 Arkansas Intercollegiate Conference: Leroy Nix Jr.  
 C. D. Chesley Company: C. D. Chesley  
 Cleveland Stadium Corporation: Dino Lucarelli  
 Cotton Bowl: Field Scovell  
 Fiesta Bowl: Jim Meyer, John Reid  
 Gator Bowl: Jim Ade, George Olsen  
 Home Box Office: Marty Glickman, Steve Powell  
 Liberty Bowl: A. F. Dudley, T. J. Foley Jr.  
 Longwood College: T. C. Dalton, Judy Johnson  
 Mercy College: Pam Smith  
 Molton, Allen and Williams: William M. Jacka  
 Newell, William E.  
 Orange Bowl: Dan McNamara, Frank Rentz  
 Oregon State University: Craig Fletcher  
 Pasadena Tournament of Roses Association: Bob Cheney, W. H.  
 Nicholas, Fred Soldwedel, Art Welsh  
 Point Loma College: Carroll B. Land  
 Sprint-Weal/Fund: Marguerite Beck-Rex  
 Sugar Bowl: Carl James, Clifford H. Kern Jr.  
 TPC Communications: Richard L. Clouser, Susan Devlin  
 U.S. Department of State: Bob Jones  
 U.S. House of Representatives: M. S. Leal, Patrick M. McLain, Mark J.  
 Raabe

### **Working News Media**

ABC Sports: Donn Bernstein  
 Associated Press: Steve Helber, Hershel Nissenson, Tom Seppy, Ed  
 Shearer  
 Athens Daily News: John Futch

Athletic Purchasing and Marketing: Gretchen Kelsey  
 Atlanta Daily World: Prentis Rogers  
 Atlanta Journal: Furman Bisher, David Davidson  
 Bradley Photographers: Jim Bradley  
 CBS Sports: Beano Cook  
 Campbell, R.  
 Campbell-Ewald Company: Lee Farrell  
 Chattanooga News-Free Press: Roy Exum  
 Chronicle of Higher Education: Steve Smith, Larry Van Dyne  
 College Football Hall of Fame: Dave Kempton, Jack Wyant  
 Daily Oklahoman: J. Carl Guymon  
 Gator Bowl: Ted Emery  
 Hattiesburg American: Rick Cleveland  
 Higher Education Daily: Chris Legg  
 Hockey and Arena Biz: Fenton Kelsey Jr.  
 KPRC-TV: David Leavell, Anita Martini  
 Knoxville Journal: Ben Byrd  
 Knoxville News-Sentinel: Tom Siler  
 Macon Telegraph and News: Harley Bowers  
 Memphis Commercial Appeal: Al Dunning  
 Memphis Press-Scimitar: John Stamm  
 Montgomery Advertiser: Ron Barnes  
 Mutual Broadcasting Company: C. Edward Little  
 Mutual Sports: Kevin Barnes  
 Nashville Banner: Fred Russell  
 Nashville Tennessean: Jimmy Davy  
 New York Times: Gordon White  
 Newsday: Dan Lauck  
 Philadelphia Inquirer: Frank Dolson, Mel Greenberg, Chuck Newman  
 Production Services of Atlanta: Jerry Crowder, Jim Hawkins  
 Salt Lake City Tribune: John Mooney  
 Scholastic Coach: Bruce Weber  
 Sport Magazine: Paul Good  
 Syracuse Journal: Tom Pipines  
 Tupelo Journal: Bill Ross  
 United Press International: Dave Moffitt, Walt Smith  
 WAGA-TV: Harmon Wages  
 WATL-TV: Art Collier  
 WRKL: Larry Escher  
 WSB-TV: Jim Henderson, Jim Viondi  
 WSB Radio: Phil Schaefer  
 Washington Post: Dave Kindred, Nancy Scannell

## 72nd ANNUAL CONVENTION OPENING SESSION

Wednesday morning, January 11, 1978

The 72nd annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by NCAA President J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin, in the Peachtree Ballroom of the Peachtree Plaza Hotel, Atlanta, Georgia.

### 1. OPENING REMARKS

**President Thompson:** I welcome you to the 72nd annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. This Association is composed of 722 active members and 46 allied members, a total membership of 768.

I should at this time like to introduce Ed Sherman, secretary-treasurer; Walter Byers, executive director, and Alan Chapman, parliamentarian.

Further, I should like to identify for you the several special committees of the Convention and introduce their chairmen. The Nominating Committee is chaired by Edward Betz, University of Pacific; the Committee on Committees by Peter Elliott, University of Miami; the Committee on Voting by Philip J. Erdle from the U.S. Air Force Academy; the Committee on Memorial Resolutions by Jack C. Patterson from Baylor University, and the Committee on Credentials by Jack Sawyer from Wake Forest University.

At this point, let me call your attention to the item in the agenda for this session regarding appointment of special committees. Those committees, which have been appointed and are listed in your program, are the Convention Committees: the Nominating Committee, Committee on Committees, Committee on Voting, Committee on Memorial Resolutions and Committee on Credentials.

In accordance with our current procedures, the reports of the sports committees and general committees are not presented orally but are included in the Annual Reports, a copy of which you have received.

The Report of the Treasurer also is not presented orally, but is included in the Annual Reports. The Report of the Secretary is in the abridged minutes of the Executive Committee, appearing, along with the Council minutes, in the Annual Reports.

At the beginning of the final business session tomorrow morning, we will entertain motions to have all of these reports received and approved by this Convention.

Finally, I bring to your attention the revisions of executive regulations approved during the past year by the Executive Committee. Those appear in the Convention Program. Executive regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of the constitution and bylaws are in

effect when adopted by the Executive Committee and are not acted upon by the Convention unless one is challenged or amended.

At this point, we move to the Report of the NCAA Council. Presenting the report is Council member Robert M. Strimer, who recently retired as director of athletics and chairman of the department of physical education at Ohio Wesleyan University.

### 2. REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

**Robert M. Strimer** (Ohio Wesleyan University): Mr. President and members of the Association: It is my privilege to appear before you this morning to present the annual report of the NCAA Council. The NCAA constitution provides that the establishment and direction of the Association's general policies between Conventions are the responsibilities of the Council. This yearly report is to inform you of the Council's work during the past year.

You will find the abridged minutes of the 1977 Council meetings in your copy of the 1976-77 Annual Reports, which you received at registration. If you will read those abridged minutes, you will have a relatively complete summary of the Council's deliberations for the past 12 months.

There have been certain major topics during the past year which deserve special mention. Foremost were the proposed new membership criteria for all three divisions of the Association, and the question of resuming NCAA membership in the United States Olympic Committee.

The 1977 annual NCAA Convention approved legislation which expanded the steering committees for the respective divisions. Serving on the Council are eight Division I representatives, four Division II members and four representatives of Division III. The Convention a year ago formalized the respective steering committees by adding to the eight Division I Council members eight additional Division I representatives, which established a Division I Steering Committee composed of 16 individuals. Comparably, the Division II Steering Committee was expanded to eight persons (four Council members and four additional representatives authorized by the 1977 Convention); and the Division III Steering Committee similarly was expanded to eight members.

The expanded steering committees have met regularly during the year; and it became clear, early in the year, that there was considerable desire among the respective divisional memberships to have additional criteria proposed for each of the three divisions. The importance of divisional membership to our respective institutions increases each year; with the expansion of NCAA championship events for each of the divisions, and the desire of members to turn to their divisional leadership for a solution to problems, there is an increased desire to refine the present divisional memberships so that each division will be composed of a more homogeneous group of institutions which have similar philosophies and program objectives.

The respective steering committees recommended additional membership criteria to the NCAA Council, and the Council voted to sponsor these proposals for consideration by the 72nd NCAA Convention this

k. These proposals may be found in your program.

Whereas some segments of the NCAA membership look upon these propositions with disfavor, let me say most positively that in the judgment of the Council, the proposals are sound and in the best interests of the membership and of the programs they sponsor.

Speaking to the Division I amendments, let me say that this issue has been before the past two regular NCAA Conventions as well as the special Association Convention. Different tactics have been used to stall consideration of the question, including what the Council believed was probably an improper tabling motion last year. We note that there is a proposition before this Convention, which has been ruled out of order by the parliamentarian, to delay consideration for a four-year period.

It is the NCAA Council's conviction that the issues raised concerning new membership criteria and restructuring will not go away. Those who have used parliamentary techniques to postpone consideration of this issue in the past also have said on the Convention floor that restructuring is essential for the welfare of the NCAA and, indeed, they have urged that specific criteria be brought before the membership so that this criteria can be acted upon. This now has been done, and the Council believes that this Convention should face up to these issues, consider them in fair and democratic discussion and vote on the respective propositions on their merit. During the ensuing round table discussions, members of the NCAA Council will speak to the various restructuring and membership criteria propositions and explain why the NCAA Council supports them and believes that they are in the long-range best interest of the membership and the Association itself.

Another subject which has occupied considerable attention has been the reorganization of the U. S. Olympic Committee and the effect that reorganization has on the NCAA's relationship with the committee. Many of you will recall that the NCAA resigned from the U. S. Olympic Committee in 1972. A substantial segment of the amateur athletic community was disenchanted, at that time, with the USOC and its ability to manage our Olympic effort.

It is not my intention here to trace all that has transpired in the intervening years. It seems appropriate to say, however, that the United States Senate in 1974, the President's Commission on Olympic Sports in its report of 1977 and finally, the U. S. Olympic Committee, itself, embraced a principle which the NCAA has advocated for some 15 years: mainly, that in the management of our international competition, there should be single-purpose national sports organizations to be the USA members in the respective international sports governing bodies and be responsible for the organization of our international entries in major competitions. It also has been our position that if these single-purpose international franchise holders are going to be given these rather awesome responsibilities, there should be some mechanism for reviewing their capabilities and, specifically, that if a franchise holder is challenged by an organization which feels that it can better serve the national interests in a particular sport, adjudication procedures should be available to judge which organization is best suited for this purpose.

We are pleased to report that the U. S. Olympic Committee, at its meeting this past April, adopted a number of significant measures, including an adequate definition of autonomy for single-purpose international franchise holders and an arbitration procedure for deciding disputes over which organization should hold international franchises. The NCAA Council, at its meeting in August, reacted favorably to the USOC decision and voted, subject to the enactment of appropriate Federal legislation, to recommend rejoining the U. S. Olympic Committee. The NCAA Council wishes to report that these negotiations are still under way. It has withdrawn, however, its thought that Federal legislation should be pursued which would amend Public Law 805.

This law charters the U. S. Olympic Committee, and initially the NCAA Council felt that P.L. 805 should be amended to place into the charter the significant reorganization of the USOC; specifically, those applying to autonomous franchise holders and the arbitration of disputes. It is clear to the NCAA Council, however, that posing Federal legislation in this area opens the door for those who believe the Federal government should adopt regulations governing the conduct of amateur sports both domestically and internationally. The NCAA Council is convinced—and it feels the member institutions are of the same mind—that higher education has had enough of Federal intrusion into the management of our institutional affairs. Upon the recommendation of the NCAA International Relations Committee, the Council no longer is endorsing Federal legislation in this area and indeed will oppose such proposals if they are made to the Congress. One of the circumstances which prompted the International Relations Committee's and the Council's decision in this was the expressed desire by some members of the Senate Commerce Committee to use the Interstate Commerce Clause as a means of adopting legislation dictating what colleges and universities may do in the enactment of eligibility rules as to the management of their programs. We find such a concept to be distasteful and, beyond that, we are fearful of the precedent which would be established and shudder at the exploitation of the years ahead if the Interstate Commerce Clause is used as a vehicle for Federal dictation to amateur sports.

Also during the past year, the Council devoted hours of consideration to the Association's enforcement program and investigative activities. I will not attempt, in this brief presentation, to go into great detail in this regard, other than to say that the program is a sound and effective one, it is absolutely essential to the rational conduct of intercollegiate athletics and we believe progress is being made in developing further respect for NCAA legislation.

It is important to note that the Council's attention to this topic in the past year has resulted in the formalization of the Association's investigative procedures, as offered for the approval of this Convention under Proposal No. 161. In addition, at its next meeting in April, the Council will hold a joint session with the Committee on Infractions to consider in detail the Association's enforcement program and consider ways and means of improving same.



Those have been some of the Council's major involvements in the past year. Before I close, let me report that the National Youth Sports Program experienced another successful year in 1977. The program now is nine years old. It is a joint activity of the NCAA, the sponsoring institutions and the federal government. In 1977, the program included 139 institutions in more than 100 cities in 43 states. The enrollment was more than 54,000 youngsters. The Council also approved another activity to benefit young people, on a pilot-program basis. It is called NCAA Volunteers for Youth and is being introduced this year in 25 institutions, where it is being received with considerable enthusiasm.

Each year the Council also spends an appreciable amount of time in each of its meetings considering interpretations of NCAA legislation. The Council is charged with that responsibility between Conventions. When the Council approves an interpretation, it is binding upon the membership in accordance with the provisions of Article 6, Section 2, of the constitution.

The Council also continues its dedication to a full program of information and promotion of intercollegiate athletics. It is responsible for the Association's ongoing campaign to keep our various publics informed of the NCAA's policies, goals and activities.

As many of you already are aware, the Federal District Court in Kansas City, Kansas, issued on Monday an opinion holding that the NCAA did not have the necessary standing, or a sufficient legally recognized interest, in order to test the validity of the Title IX regulations. The court thus ordered the NCAA's action dismissed, without ever reaching or considering the important substantive issue raised by the NCAA's complaint—including whether the HEW Title IX regulations, insofar as they relate to intercollegiate athletics, are authorized under the terms of the Title IX statute passed by Congress. I repeat—this substantive issue was not resolved by the court's action last Monday, and remains an open one for each institution confronted with the compliance requirements of the Title IX regulations.

Our attorneys currently are studying the judge's opinion, with a view to determining whether an appeal to the U. S. Court of Appeals in Denver is appropriate. The Council will not be in a position to make this decision for several weeks. If an appeal is made, it will be undertaken essentially to overturn the court's very narrow interpretation of the NCAA's right to standing. Preliminarily, we feel this probably should be done to protect the NCAA's interests to adequately represent itself as well as its members in future legal issues. We wish to make clear, however, that if an appeal is pursued, it will have little practical effect in clarifying the legality and application of certain Title IX regulations insofar as the interests of member institutions are concerned. Even a successful appeal by the NCAA on the issue of standing is no assurance that the main suit would be pursued at that time because of the time factor involved. It probably would take as much as two years to obtain the first Federal court ruling on the substantive issues.

Mr. President, that concludes this report of the NCAA Council. Since this oral presentation is but a summary, and since the abridged minutes

contain the bulk of the Council's record for the year, I would recommend that the delegates be given time to read those minutes. I will present a motion at the beginning of the final business session tomorrow that the full report be accepted and approved by this convention.

**President Thompson:** Thank you very much, Bob. As he indicated you will have a chance to study the reports and he will present a motion on behalf of the Council tomorrow morning. At this time, I would like to ask Jack Patterson to come forward and present the resolutions committee report.

### 3. REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

**Jack C. Patterson** (Baylor University): Thank you, Mr. President. At this time, I would like to introduce the members of my committee. They are Earl Banks, Morgan State University, and Mr. Arthur C. Nicolai, Nebraska Wesleyan University.

At this time, I should like to read the list of our friends and colleagues that have passed away since our last meeting. They are:

Paul Alley, New Mexico State University  
 Charles Bassett, Texas A&M University  
 Bernie Bierman, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis  
 Albert Boles, University of California, Berkeley  
 Mel Brewer, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale  
 Vaughan Corley, New Mexico State University  
 Russell "Jake" Daubert, Michigan State University  
 Eric DeGroat, Appalachian State University  
 Joseph G. Echols, Norfolk State College  
 Charles P. Erickson, Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill  
 Gerald Ehrlich, Columbia University  
 Ellwood Geiges, Eastern College Athletic Conference  
 Lew Hirt, Xavier University  
 Stu Holcomb, Purdue University  
 Bob Hudson, University of Evansville  
 Roy Keene, Oregon State University  
 George Lyle, Lincoln University (Mo.)  
 Clarkie Mayfield, Jackson State University  
 Ned McDonald, University of Virginia  
 Wayne Replogle, University of Kansas  
 Adolph Samborski, Yankee Conference  
 Bruce Shepard, Northeast Louisiana University  
 Norm Shepard, Harvard University  
 John F. Skillman, Yale University  
 Fred Telonicher, Humboldt State University  
 Robert Watson, University of Evansville  
 Clifford Wells, National Association of Basketball Coaches  
 Virgil Yelkin, University of Nebraska, Omaha  
 Gus Young, Gustavus Adolphus College

Of course along with this list is the shock of the year, the tragedy which struck the University of Evansville. All of us in intercollegiate athletics were deeply saddened and we all offer our deepest consolation

and prayers to this great university. At this time, I should like to ask the membership to stand for a moment of silent prayer.

[The Assembly rose in a moment of silent prayer in memory of their departed colleagues.]

#### 4. ADDITIONAL REMARKS

**President Thompson:** As you know, our meetings are conducted under the procedures authorized and prescribed by Robert's Rules of Order and the Newly Revised Issue. One such procedure is the need to adopt the Convention Program prior to the beginning of our business.

You received a copy of the printed program prior to the beginning of our business, and I should like now at this time to entertain a motion to adopt the program of this Convention.

[The motion was made, seconded and approved.]

Robert's Rules of Order provides that the procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such procedures and several of them are reviewed in the material in the program. In addition, you will find a reference listing of all the Association's legislation which deals with our Convention.

Let me call your attention to some procedures which are especially pertinent.

Robert's Rules of Order states, on Page 183, that a basic principle of parliamentary law is, "that only a two-thirds vote can rightfully suppress a main question without allowing free debate." With this in mind, it is useful to note the differences among the several kinds of motions which may be used to delay or suppress action on a provision before this body.

First, let us consider tabling motions. A motion to lay on the table, which is not debatable, is properly used in an assembly that meets less often than quarterly; only to lay the pending question aside temporarily when something more urgent has arisen. Further, Robert's Rules of Order states if an important question must be settled immediately and there is no urgent reason for the assembly to lay it aside, a motion to lay the question on the table is clearly dilatory and should be ruled out of order.

In other words, a motion to table is often incorrectly used with the intention of either killing a question or suppressing a question without debate. Any motion to table in this Convention, which is designed to prevent debate or kill a motion, thus will be ruled out of order. Please remember our earlier explanation that only a two-thirds vote can suppress debate.

It is important to note that a motion laid on the table may be removed at a later time. At some recent NCAA Conventions there have been immediate motions to reconsider a previous tabled voting, and the subsequent defeat of that reconsideration vote has been used to ensure that the tabling motion cannot be considered again since an action can be considered only one time. However, under Robert's Rules of Order, such a technique may not be properly applied to a tabling motion.

Much of the confusion regarding tabling motions in this country

arises on their use in the U.S. House of Representatives where such motions have a special meaning not applicable in the ordinary assemblies, according to Page 182 of Robert's Rules.

If the delegate actually desires to kill a motion or suppress debate on a motion, there are several avenues to explore. First is the motion to postpone indefinitely. Robert's Rules of Order, pages 105 to 107, set this forth. This motion denies consideration of a proposition for the remainder of a meeting, and it is the proper way to kill a motion. However, debate is permitted on this motion because only a majority vote is required to pass it. That debate may include discussion of a main motion.

All of this procedure is in keeping with the principles outlined earlier, that only a two-thirds vote may suppress debate of an issue properly before an assembly to enhance our chances of completing our business at this Convention, we have added four-and-one-half hours to the time scheduled for our business sessions on Thursday and Friday. I repeat that. That is four-and-one-half hours.

I am hopeful we can complete our legislative program in that period. To further that cause, we will begin each session promptly at the applied hour and the appointed hour, and we urge you to be seated and to be ready for the call of order at that time. There are other procedures we have employed in attempting to use our time effectively. The chair will attempt to eyeball as many votes as possible, calling for a count by the Voting Committee only when there is doubt as to majority.

In this vein, I will ask all delegates to refrain from calling for a vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of an issue. The chair will call for all votes as quickly as possible after each motion is made and seconded. The delegates that intend to debate an issue, may I ask that they be at one of the microphone locations and ready to speak when the motion has been made and seconded.

If the chair sees no one at a microphone, the vote will be called for. On bylaw issues, the chair will call for the vote in the same divisional sequence in each instance. It will be Division I first, then Division II and then Division III. The results of a division's vote are not announced until all divisions have voted.

Let me call your attention to the topical groupings of amendments and also to the index in the back of the program, which is helpful in locating proposed amendments to special portions of the constitution and bylaws. The Convention publications are designed to enable you to use either your Official Notice or the Convention Program. The proposal numbers and page numbers are the same in each book other than typographical errors have been corrected. The only substantial changes upon Official Notice in the Convention Program occur in proposal No. 172 which was incorrectly presented in the official notice, with a number of words inadvertently omitted.

In addition, one new executive regulation was added to the Convention Program. It deals with committee expenses.

Each year we review the voting and speaking privileges of the NCAA Convention. Each active member institution may have three accredited delegates, one voting and two alternates. They may exchange the



voting privilege among themselves because all have been approved as voters by their institutions. They also may have visiting delegates if they wish. However, those visitors may not take part in the business proceedings.

Allied conferences, which have voting privileges in accordance with Constitution 4-3-(b)-(2) have the same voting and speaking rights as the active members. An allied conference which does not have a vote and any affiliated member organization may have one official delegate who is permitted to speak but not to vote.

We ask all individuals to identify themselves and their affiliation when they desire to speak. Those delegates wearing Convention badges with ribbons are permitted to speak. Those without ribbons are visitors and may not take part in these proceedings.

The amendment-to-amendments deadline is 1 p.m. today as prescribed by the constitution and bylaws. Amendments to amendments must be submitted on a special form.

Please be reminded that the business session will begin promptly at 9 a.m. tomorrow, with consideration of two consent packages. These are proposals Nos. 1 through 20 in your Convention Program. The consent packages are designed to permit fast actions on proposals considered to be noncontroversial or housekeeping. Any item in those packages may be removed for debate and a separate vote at the request of any delegate.

With that in mind, I should like to conclude this session and remind you of the Divisions I, II and III round tables. I should suggest that we move rapidly to the specified areas so as to participate in the round table discussions.

[The Convention broke up into the respective divisions for the round table discussions.]

## DIVISION I ROUND TABLE

Wednesday, January 11, 1978

The Division I round table of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was held at 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, January 11, in the Plaza Ballroom of the Peachtree Plaza Hotel, Ernest C. Casale, Temple University, presiding. The panelists for the session included Cecil N. Coleman, University of Illinois; John Toner, University of Connecticut; Wiles Hallock, Pacific-8 Conference; Harry E. Troxell, Colorado State University; Kenneth W. Herrick, Texas Christian University; Charley Scott, University of Alabama; Fred Picard, Ohio University; Edward S. Betz, University of the Pacific; Eugene F. Corrigan, University of Virginia, and E. John Larsen, University of Southern California.

[NOTE: The following is a summary of the round table discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Chairman Casale indicated the round table first would be directed toward the restructuring proposals which would be before the Convention and then would consider other proposals if time permitted. He indicated the members of the panel would present various segments of the restructuring plan and all presentations would be made before the session was open to questions from the audience.

The basis of restructuring was proposal No. 27. Amendments to its elements were contained in Nos. 28 through 35, and Nos. 36 and 37 were separate restructuring proposals.

The discussion was initiated by Mr. Coleman, who stated that following defeat of a reorganization plan at the 1977 Convention most members of the Council felt there would be no further proposals of that nature in the near future.

However, a cross section of the membership produced such a strong groundswell of support for restructuring of Division I football that the officers established a committee with broad geographical representation to study the matter, joined by the Collegiate Commissioners Association and the expanded Steering Committee for Division I. All made recommendations to the Council that a restructuring plan be created and proposed. The result, after a year of study, writing and review, was proposal No. 27.

Mr. Coleman then reviewed the origin of the concept of divisions within the Association. Initially, some 30 years ago, major institutions were grouped for statistical purposes. Subsequently, divisions were created in basketball and finally, in 1973, the Association was organized into three legislative and competitive divisions. The basis of that action, he stated, was that a large segment of the membership did not

feel its needs were being adequately served, primarily because they were not grouped with other institutions with similar program objectives. Proposal No. 27 addressed the same issues, he said, with intention to establish additional criteria for membership in Division I football, with the criteria to apply to Division I-A if Division I football were divided. It also explained the application of the criteria to institutions classified Division I-A and noted the criteria for both subdivisions would have to be met within three years of adoption. Further, he noted, much, if not all, the subjective evaluation of institutions by the Classification Committee would be eliminated in favor of specific criteria by the passage of No. 27.

Mr. Toner then presented an analysis of 27-B, 27-C and 27-D. He identified 27-B as the proposal which would divide Division I football into two subdivisions; 27-C as providing for amendment of appropriate bylaws by the respective subdivisions, and 27-D as establishing criteria for Division I-AA football. He noted 27-D was a common bylaw and must be approved by each division voting separately. He stated it is obvious that two distinct tiers exist in Division I football, regardless of the measuring device employed. He characterized proposal No. 27 as recognizing the existence of those two tiers.

Mr. Hallock then reviewed 27-E, which provided that separate voting may be conducted on legislative issues pertaining only to the sport of basketball and established criteria for membership in Division I basketball and other sports. He went on to point out Proposal No. 37-A related to No. 27-E in that it provided an institution could be a member of Division I basketball, but have the remainder of its program in Division II or Division III. He also explained that the proposal required for membership in Division I basketball eight sports, including football, or 10 sports if football was not sponsored. Anticipating the question, he explained the difference reflected the conviction of the Division I Steering Committee that the ultimate test for membership in Division I should be the commitment of the institution to a broadly based program and the opportunity for a large number of male students to participate in varsity intercollegiate athletics. Since most Division I member institutions' football programs afford competitive opportunity for 80 to 100 students, it was felt that if an institution did not conduct football, it should provide comparable competitive opportunities in other sports. Hence, the additional requirement, although the two sports probably would not accommodate 80 additional students, was considered a fair compromise by the Council.

Mr. Hallock also reviewed the intent of Proposals Nos. 33, 34, 35 and 35-A, which were designed to amend 27-E.

Mr. Troxell reviewed proposal No. 27-F, which provided a provisional membership category position for a period of one year if an institution, after declaring Division I-A or I-AA football or Division I basketball and meeting the appropriate criteria, thereafter failed to remain in compliance with the criteria. He noted if the institution did not again come into compliance at the end of the one-year provisional membership period, it would be reclassified into a division for which it met the existing criteria, or if not qualified for any division, reclassified as an associate member. He noted the proposal did not provide four years for

an institution to meet the new criteria.

He then noted 27-G, which clarified that to vote on legislative items relating to Division I which did not pertain solely to football or basketball, an institution must be a voting member of Division I-A football, Division I-AA football or Division I basketball.

Mr. Herrick discussed proposal No. 27-H, which required that the sports utilized in meeting the sponsorship requirements of proposal No. 27 must be those in which the Association sponsors a championship meet or tournament. It provided a minimum number of contests which must be completed each year and ground rules under which the counting must be done. He stated the numbers in 27-H were based upon the data developed in the 1975 length of season study conducted by the NCAA, and called the minimums figures that virtually every Division I institution could meet with little difficulty.

Mr. Toner returned to discuss 27-I. He noted it provided opportunity for a Division I-AA football member to use the criteria of I-A under prescribed conditions. He stated the institution would lose most privileges of Division I-AA, including television, but retain voting privileges in I-AA on football issues. Such an institution would, however, be eligible for television appearances in Division I-A football. The final paragraph of 27-I provides that a Division I allied conference whose members are divided between Division I-A football and Division I-AA football shall vote in the subdivision in which the majority of its members are classified. If its membership were divided equally, the Council would determine the subdivision in which it would vote. Mr. Toner stated he anticipated an institution would utilize proposal No. 27-I if it were preparing to move from I-AA to I-A. He noted it is not as helpful as a probationary membership in that the member of Division I-A would not receive credit for a game against a I-AA member utilizing 27-I, but unlike the probationary membership mechanism, there is no time limit on the period in which a member institution may utilize No. 27-I.

Mr. Picard then reviewed proposal No. 36, a resolution authorizing the NCAA Executive Committee to conduct a mail ballot of the Division I-AA football membership to determine the interest of those institutions in sponsoring a Division I-AA Football Championship and a separate statistics program for that subdivision. If a majority of the institutions responded favorably, the Executive Committee would be authorized to establish a pilot program in those two areas for the 1978 football season. He noted the present NCAA football contract provided for coverage of the semifinals and championship game of a Division I-AA Football Championship if established. Mr. Casale then asked Executive Director Walter Byers to expand upon the television reference.

Speaking to both regular-season and championship telecasts, Mr. Byers first noted the Television Committee, when negotiating a new television contract with the American Broadcasting Company, provided for coverage of a Division I-AA Football Championship on the assumption it would probably be an eight-team championship. The semifinal games would be televised on a regional basis and the championship nationally, with a rights fee designated at \$750,000. The

television income would go to championship income and would be shared by all participants in the playoff. If the championship were not held, the rights fee would revert to the general rights fees paid institutions appearing on the NCAA series.

Next, in order to explain the regular-season program envisioned for Divisions I-A and I-AA, Mr. Byers reviewed the provisions of the 1976-1977 NCAA Television Plan governing appearances. In those years, he stated, there were appearances built in for certain conferences, including those which the carrying network would not normally pick based on public acceptance of their games. In 1976-1977, two minimum appearances were guaranteed each conference of six Division I members during the two-year period of the plan.

In creating the new 1978-1981 plan, the Television Committee felt less protection should be afforded institutions which felt their programs were nationally prominent. At the same time, it did consider favorably protection for five conferences which it felt would not receive appearances without guarantees and independent institutions which had not appeared for a minimum of three seasons. Accordingly, it devised a plan whereby such institutions were placed in a second tier, eventually composed of 56 institutions. The five conferences included in that group were the Mid-American, Southland, Missouri Valley, Pacific Coast and Southern. They were joined by 19 independent institutions. The group was afforded 16 appearances on the national series in each two-year period of the four-year plan. That would remain in effect, he stated, if I-A/I-AA were not adopted. He then addressed the question what guarantees would be afforded I-AA if proposal No. 27 were adopted. He stated the Television Committee could not negotiate that point to conclusion with ABC, even as a contingency, because there was no means by which to forecast the number of institutions which might join Division I-AA. He then reported a commitment of the Television Committee and Council that I-AA would be afforded appearances, depending on its size, in the same ratio that the second tier of the current Division I had been guaranteed under the new plan, or an approximate ratio of 16 to 56. He noted it would be even more attractive for Division I-AA because of the three national playoff games each year. The rights fees for the regular-season appearances will be the same as for any other institution appearing on the national series.

Chairman Casale then invited questions and comments from the audience. Ken Germann, commissioner of the Southern Conference, spoke about resolution No. 38, explaining its sponsors felt college football was at its zenith with attendance, television ratings and television revenues at their highest and no change should be made in the sport. Further, it was an attempt to give current NCAA legislation a chance to work. He stated there was no attempt to table No. 27 or stop discussion of the restructuring, that in order to give full and free discussion of the problems involved in the Association, No. 38 would be withdrawn. Jim Jarrett, director of athletics at Old Dominion University, stated there were not 10 sports required by the legislation in which his institution's students were interested. He questioned why other sports could not be included and counted. Chairman Casale responded the Steering Committee and Council felt only the NCAA sports should

be included and Mr. Hallock suggested an amendment could be offered in the future.

James Drinnon, president of the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga, asked what would be the effect of the passage of 27-A and the failure of 27-B and vice versa. Mr. Casale and Mr. Hallock responded that if A passed and B failed, the criteria of A then would be applicable to all members of Division I football, which would have three years to meet the new criteria. If A failed and B passed, subdivisions I-A and I-AA would have been created. Each would have the criteria of the current Division I football, subject only to possible passage of new criteria for I-AA when 27-D was considered.

Phil Shriver, president of Miami University (Ohio), a member of the Classification Committee, questioned whether the proposal should not have been considered by that committee, which a year earlier had voted not to recommend a restructuring of Division I football. He inquired as to which committees had considered restructuring. Mr. Coleman responded that initial preparation had been undertaken by a special committee of individuals representing Division I institutions appointed by President Thompson and the proposals were reviewed by the Division I, II and III Steering Committees and the Collegiate Commissioners Association. Mr. Shriver then repeated that the last word from the Classification Committee was that "... reclassification of Division I institutions is not necessarily in the best interests of intercollegiate athletics." Mr. Hallock, also a member of the Classification Committee, responded that he attributed the position of the committee to the fact that no criteria had been established under which such a reclassification could be made within Division I football. He noted that as a result of the recommendation, the Council determined that it should go about the problem the other way around and seek to develop criteria before trying to make a classification. It then attempted one proposal in 1977, which was tabled before it could be considered by the Convention, and was active in preparation of a proposal for the 1978 Convention.

Bob Murphy, director of athletics at San Jose State, then spoke at length in opposition to restructuring. He noted his earlier association with major universities and football programs at a high level, although his current commitment is to a university on the borderline insofar as meeting the proposed criteria. He stated his institution's program was intense and broadly based. He stated the so-called "Robin Hood proposals" had been defeated and should not concern major football institutions. He charged the criteria were drawn to fit the plan rather than to determine it, stating the 79 institutions which apparently meet the criteria constitute 55 per cent of the vote in Division I football. He challenged the validity of stadium size as a criteria, noting some stadiums were built in the 1920s and 1930s and powers such as Southern California and UCLA do not own a stadium. He stated the game had never been better nor teams more balanced. He spoke against the more demanding scheduling criteria which an institution would be required to meet in three years. He pointed out schedules are solid for 12 to 15 years in the future. He stated the restructuring proposal would cause a breakup of conferences and the demise of football programs, continuing "I doubt there has ever been legislation before an NCAA Convention

that would be more harmful to more institutions than this restructuring plan." He concluded that the institutions threatened by restructuring only wanted an opportunity to compete upward against the best, only what they had had since 1890.

Lou Myers, University of Arizona, chairman of the NCAA Classification Committee, commented on statements by the previous speakers. He agreed that the Classification Committee had had a difficult time with separation of Division I teams, but pointed out the restructuring plan the committee developed was based primarily upon the old strength-of-schedule criterion, but those guidelines were very subjective. He agreed with Mr. Hallock that the committee had learned from its hearings that more objective criteria were needed on which to base classification. Time and again, he stated, the committee heard from presidents of institutions, directors of athletics, and faculty representatives, "Tell us what to do and we will do it." Proposal No. 27, he stated, does have objective criteria.

As to why the Classification Committee was not assigned the role of developing the current proposal, he noted it is composed of three members from each division and proposal No. 27 is a restructuring only of Division I. He stated he personally felt it was more appropriate for the Division I Steering Committee to have acted rather than the Classification Committee.

Mr. Toner noted that there might have been an impression that both the Division I Steering Committee and the Council unanimously supported the legislation, but such was not the case in either body.

Fred Jacoby, commissioner of the Mid-American Conference, denied that the Collegiate Commissioners Association approved the plan. He stated four of the 11 members of that body were not contacted concerning the proposal. He stated it was only discussed in June after it became a fact. He also commented on the scheduling requirement, which he termed a "lockout" due to the Mid-American Conference having 10 members, only two of which would meet the criteria. Even if an institution were to withdraw from the conference, he stated, its schedule would be locked in for 10 years in advance.

Fran Rienzo of Georgetown University questioned why 27-E was included in restructuring inasmuch as discussion of the need for additional reorganization had been limited, in his experience, to football matters. Mr. Casale responded that some members feel Division I is too large and getting larger. Mr. Hallock added that the basic premise of those who developed the restructuring plan was that to be a member of Division I, an institution should conduct a broadly based athletic program, implying that those who did not should not be members of Division I.

Mr. Toner then made a strong statement in support of adoption of Proposal No. 27 on the basis that it would afford the so-called "brown paddle" colleges the opportunity to declare their football programs as a part of either I-A or I-AA football. He pointed that at the time of reorganization in 1973, the institutions could, and did, declare their overall programs to be in Division I, but were restricted from doing so in the sport of football because of their classification in Division II.

Mickey Holmes, commissioner of the Missouri Valley Conference, asked why when an institution has three years to comply with the proposed criteria, the attendance factor therein was based on a four-year period. Mr. Coleman responded the steering committees and Council felt it fair to provide a four-year period so two sets of home and away games could be included. The three-year period for compliance is provided by Bylaw 8-1-(c). Richard Adinano, Seton Hall University, questioned the order of 27-A and 27-B. Parliamentarian Alan Chapman explained they are unrelated and do not make each other moot. He stated the Council felt that since restructuring was a Division I football question it would be best for the entire membership to see how it would vote on the criteria before the vote to divide I-A and I-AA was taken. Mr. Casale agreed it made little difference which came first and Mr. Chapman pointed out a change of order could be voted by the Convention.

Mr. Casale noted that inasmuch as no additional speakers were approaching the microphone to discuss restructuring, it would be appropriate to proceed by utilizing the remaining time to discuss the various proposals before the Convention related to Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG). Ed Betz, University of the Pacific, was then called upon to describe proposals Nos. 48, 49 and 50 set forth in the Convention Program.

Mr. Betz noted that proposal No. 48 would exempt BEOG awards from inclusion in the computation of maximum allowable financial aid. On the other hand, proposal No. 49 would limit the combination of a student-athlete's BEOG award and his institutional aid to the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and the amount assigned to miscellaneous expenses under the BEOG "cost of education" formula. Mr. Betz explained that a primary purpose of proposals No. 49 and 50 was to enable a student-athlete who is a BEOG recipient to receive the same amount of institutional financial aid whether he lives on or off campus.

## DIVISION II ROUND TABLE

Wednesday, January 11, 1978

The Division II round table of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was held at 9:30 a.m. Wednesday, January 11, in the American-French-English Rooms of the Peachtree Plaza Hotel. James Frank, Lincoln (Mo.) University, chairman of the Division II Steering Committee, presided. Panelists included the other members of the Division II Steering Committee: Sherwood O. Berg, South Dakota State University; Robert C. Brown, Southeastern Louisiana University; John R. Eiler, East Stroudsburg State College; Hubert Heitman Jr., University of California, Davis; Andrew Laska, Assumption College; Thomas J. Martin, Roanoke College, and Gil Peterson, Western Illinois University.

[NOTE: The following is a summary of the round table discussions. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Preliminary to the discussion, Mr. Frank introduced the members of the committee and outlined its composition, duties and functions. He stated that the committee is preparing a statement of philosophy for Division II and invited those present to advance suggestions regarding such a statement to the members of the committee.

### Division II Membership Criteria

Mr. Eiler explained proposals Nos. 39 and 16 regarding criteria for membership in Division II. Proposal No. 39 requires sponsorship of at least five varsity intercollegiate sports as a criterion and it also establishes a minimum number of contests which must be completed and the minimum number of participants in order for a sport to be considered as "sponsored." It was agreed that only the minimum number of sports must meet the criteria of participants and contests.

Lew Comer, California Collegiate Athletic Association, spoke in support of proposal No. 40 which requires institutions in Division II to sponsor six sports in Division II and schedule at least 60 per cent of their games against Division II or Division I opponents. Some members expressed concern for the scheduling requirement due to geographical considerations and conference alignments.

### Student-Athlete Statement

Mr. Laska reminded the delegates of their responsibilities in regard to Constitution 3-9-(j) and 4-2-(d) which require all student-athletes to sign a statement annually prior to competing in any intercollegiate competition. He stated that these statements are required whether or not the institution will compete in NCAA meets and tournaments during that academic year.

It was noted that an amendment is proposed to this legislation which would restrict access to these documents to representatives of the NCAA national office only, deleting the opportunity for other member institutions to examine them.

Since no "destruct date" is shown on the form or indicated in the legislation, members were advised to keep these forms on file until such time as the Council developed a policy in this area.

It was the sense of the meeting that it is permissible to have several athletes in the room at the same time, explain the rules and the form to them and have each person sign the form in the presence of the director of athletics prior to leaving the room. The coaches involved also would sign the form at that time.

### Consent Package

Mr. Frank briefly reviewed the contents of the "consent package" noting that Nos. 13 and 20 will be withdrawn. A question was raised regarding No. 11. Mr. Frank gave assurance that the amendment will not preclude Division II athletes from qualifying for Division I championships in the various individual sports.

### Amateurism

Mr. Berg explained proposal No. 21, amending Constitution 3 to permit a student-athlete who has been selected for an Olympic team to receive payment for the amount of money he ordinarily would earn during the period (usually not more than eight weeks) he is training for the competition.

### Membership Classification

The group discussed possible effects of the Division I reorganization proposals upon Division II members. No conclusions were reached although delegates were advised to study the proposals closely in the event the entire Division I reorganization package is not adopted. If that happens, some delegates felt Division II programs may suffer depending upon the amendments adopted.

### Financial Aid

Discussion centered around the proposal to reduce the permissible number of football awards in Division II from 60 to 45. A wide range of comments were heard including the constant rise in costs forcing a reduction to those who must have 60 grants-in-aid to be competitive in their areas.

### Five-Year Rule

The group discussed several proposals to amend the five-year rule. Several delegates spoke in favor of amending the legislation on the basis that students now take longer to complete their education and some surveys show a high incidence of transfer during their academic careers.

### Summer Basketball

A proposal to once again permit student-athletes to participate in organized summer basketball competition was discussed. Tom Niland, LeMoyne College (N.Y.), spoke in favor of the amendment noting the several restrictions placed upon the competition and citing the paucity



of foreign tours available to Division II members.

#### **Recruiting**

Mr. Peterson led the group in a general discussion of the proposed amendments to the recruiting regulations noting that some proposals could require additional expenditures.

#### **Playing and Practice Seasons**

Mr. Laska reviewed the amendments to lengthen the basketball season, increase the number of football games and provide basketball teams with two scrimmages which would not be counted toward the 27-game limit.

#### **Women's Championships**

Edward S. Steitz, Springfield College, discussed the proposal to establish Division II championships for women in the sports of basketball, gymnastics and swimming. He noted many NCAA members are not members of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics For Women (AIAW) therefore, their women's teams have no postseason opportunities. He denied the allegation that the intent of the proposal is to damage the AIAW—citing the support Springfield College has given AIAW over several years. A straw vote was taken which approved the proposal, 51-21.

## **DIVISION III ROUND TABLE**

**Wednesday, January 11, 1978**

The Division III round table of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was held from 10 to 11:45 a.m. in the Georgian/Spanish/Confederate Rooms of the Peachtree Plaza Hotel. Ross H. Smith, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, presided. Panelists for the round table were: Robert M. Strimer, Ohio Wesleyan University; Herbert B. Thompson, Fisk University; Raymond J. Whispell, Muhlenberg College; Gordon Brewer, Hope College; Edward W. Malan, Pomona-Pitzer Colleges; Robert F. Riedel, Geneseo State University College; Kenneth J. Weller, Central College, and David Berst, director of enforcement, NCAA. [NOTE: The following is a summary of the round table discussion. Only discussions of a significant nature concerning proposed amendments will be summarized. A complete transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

#### **Division III Philosophy**

Mr. Smith opened the round table discussion by introducing Mr. Weller who offered his views with regard to Division III philosophy. [NOTE: Mr. Weller's statement was subsequently summarized and published in the March 1, 1978, edition of the NCAA News.]

#### **Transfer Rules**

It was noted that Proposals Nos. 106 and 107 were intended to eliminate certain restrictions related to institutional financial aid to transfer students. Further, No. 106 would permit a student to continue to receive aid based on his academic performance at a second institution and would also permit private institutions to offer financial aid packages to compete with state assistance programs. In terms of transfer students at Division I and II member institutions who have been permitted to receive grants-in-aid, Nos. 106 and 107 appeared to be at least as demanding as current regulations. Mr. Riedel reported that Proposal No. 108 would establish a procedure to permit transfer students from nonmember institutions to be immediately eligible to compete in Division III championships. It was noted this legislation does not conflict with Division III regulations affecting transfers from member institutions. A majority of the delegates present favored the adoption of these proposals.

#### **Eligibility**

Mr. Malan stated that it would be beneficial for Division III member institutions to consider applying NCAA championship eligibility regulations set forth in Bylaw 4 to regular-season competition. It was noted that some conferences have applied championship regulations in this manner because of automatic qualification requirements in particular sports. However, concern was expressed that the selection of partici-

pants in Division III championships has been difficult inasmuch as numerous institutions have permitted student-athletes to participate in regular-season competition with the knowledge that they would not be eligible to participate in a championship event. In a show of hands related to this issue, 22 of 126 delegates indicated the institutions they represent have not applied NCAA championship regulations to regular-season competition. Nineteen of the 22 indicated they represent institutions with conference affiliations.

#### **Division III Criteria**

Mr. Malan reported that Proposal No. 41 was developed based on an October 1977 Division III membership questionnaire. Lengthy discussion ensued regarding minimum scheduling requirements. It was noted that Division III member institutions would have a three-year period to comply with any membership criteria adopted and may also apply for a waiver of such criteria under the provisions set forth in No. 41. Mr. Weller noted that Proposal No. 42 was intended to modify a requirement to compute financial need on the basis of the Parents Confidential Statement of the College Scholarship Service, and would also permit awards of circumstance or awards based on a student's academic record. In a show of hands, the delegates supported establishing additional Division III criteria. However, several delegates expressed their opinions that the Division III Steering Committee should continue to study issues regarding awards of circumstance, true academic awards and the effect athletic ability should have upon the composition of institutional financial aid packages for student-athletes. In a show of hands, the delegates overwhelmingly supported the proposition that athletic ability should be treated identical to any other extracurricular activity in determining the composition of financial aid packages. In light of the discussion, the proponents of Proposals Nos. 43 and 44 indicated that they planned to withdraw these proposals.

#### **Division I-A and I-AA**

Mr. Sherman briefly reviewed the history of previous restructuring attempts and called upon Division III members to carefully consider the issues related to Proposals Nos. 27 and 37 inasmuch as certain paragraphs included in these proposals require the approval of Division III delegates.

#### **Consent Packages**

Mr. Whispell reported that Proposal No. 13 would be withdrawn from the bylaw consent package (Nos. 9-20). It was noted that the proposals included in the constitutional consent package (Nos. 1-8) and those included in the bylaw consent package would not be considered individually unless there is an objection inasmuch as the proposals are considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature.

## **HONORS LUNCHEON**

**Wednesday, January 11, 1978**

The 13th annual honors luncheon was held in the Peachtree Ballroom of the Peachtree Plaza Hotel, NCAA President J. Neils Thompson presiding.

**President Thompson:** Ladies and gentlemen, may I have your attention. It is my distinct privilege to welcome each of you to the National Collegiate Athletic Association's annual honors luncheon. At this time, I should like to ask you to please rise while the Rev. Edward Warner, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Atlanta, presents the invocation.

**Father Warner:** God, we pause in your name and presence to give thanks for the opportunity to honor those worthy of honor and to give you thanks for the privilege that we have to use our minds and our bodies to their fullest potential. Extend your blessings upon this gathering here, upon the activities of this day. Bless the food that we receive to our use. Bless us to your service. Keep us ever mindful of those less fortunate than we are, and more than that, that we rise to do something about the needs of others. In your name, we pray.

**President Thompson:** Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: I know that we are a few minutes late, but we have exceeded our record crowd and we have more than 1,000 persons attending this luncheon. This is a great tribute to a fine group of athletes, former and current, whom we are honoring today.

This is the one occasion during our Convention when we can turn our thoughts away from the business at hand and reflect upon the many values of intercollegiate athletics, and the meaningful impact student-athletes have on their campuses, their communities, their states and our nation.

Reviewing the accomplishments of these individuals we honor today, and those who have preceded them or will fill these roles in the future, will permit each of us to rekindle our belief that an individual's participation in athletics is one of the most worthwhile, challenging and influential activities he can undertake in adapting to society and in preparing to meet goals he will establish in all walks of life.

These individuals have met monumental challenges, and their impact on their fellow man easily is evidenced by their deeds. Each has accepted leadership responsibilities in a broad area of activities, and his contributions have made life better for the environments he represents.

We appreciate these individuals permitting us to honor them today, and we thank them for the positive reflections their activities have brought to intercollegiate athletics.

Before I introduce our master of ceremonies, I want to present two individuals at the dais who have assisted me tremendously during my

year in the presidency of the NCAA.

The first is an individual who earned a national reputation as an outstanding football coach before becoming a full-time administrator. He is a valued friend and colleague, and he is an outstanding representative for the Association. I am happy to present Secretary-Treasurer Edgar A. Sherman, director of athletics at Muskingum College.

There is no way that I could introduce adequately the executive director of the NCAA, but I am going to say a couple of brief sentences. He is "Mr. NCAA" in many respects. Those that have worked with him come to know him to be a dedicated individual to intercollegiate athletics of the NCAA, dedicated with the tenacity that has no fear in our sphere of operations and we are grateful to him for what he does. Walter Byers.

It is a very great pleasure on my part particularly to be able to introduce a friend of intercollegiate athletics, and of the NCAA for many years. My colleagues from the Southwest Athletic Conference have known Lindsey Nelson for a long time, because he has covered our Cotton Bowl games on 17 occasions.

From this standpoint, we appreciate very much his contribution. Lindsey is also known for his closet of sports jackets. I am anxious for you to see the one that he is wearing today. I don't believe I have ever seen him wear the same jacket twice. If I have, I don't blame him. (Laughter)

There is only one in the NCAA that can match him, and I bet a number of you know who that might be. Athletic Director Ed Czekaj of Pennsylvania State must either receive Lindsey's hand-me-downs or Lindsey receives his hand-me-downs. I don't know which way it is. (Laughter) Seriously, Lindsey has been one of the best and busiest football announcers in the country over the past 25 years. He currently does the television replay of Notre Dame football games each Saturday; a National Football League game for CBS on Sunday afternoon, and is the radio voice for NFL Monday night football over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

He also just completed his 16th year as the voice of the New York Mets. It is not unusual for Lindsey to broadcast as many as 54 games in a season and he has announced 10 different postseason games. This University of Tennessee graduate was manager of sports for NBC 10 years and was associated with the NCAA Football Game of the Week for 11 years for both NBC and CBS.

He has been with CBS 12 years. His outstanding achievements have been recognized by his peers. He has been selected the No. 1 sportscaster in the nation by the National Sportscasters and Sportswriters Association on four occasions. Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to present our master of ceremonies, Lindsey Nelson.

**Lindsey Nelson:** Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: Well, the secret is out. I get all the jackets from Ed Czekaj, and he has this color blind tailor from whom he gets them and he passes them on to me. (Laughter) I wear them because years ago when I started in this profession I came to Atlanta and met an old friend, the late Bill Mundy.

I was inquiring of Bill Mundy what was necessary to become a successful sportscaster. Bill Mundy said, "If you ain't got no talent, dress funny." (Laughter) So in 25 years I have found it works fairly well. (Laughter)

I can't tell you what a great pleasure it is to be back among the NCAA people that I have spent so many happy years with. I had the privilege of being associated with the NCAA television football package when it began 25 years ago in 1952, and some members of that Television Committee are still active.

Walter Byers was a member of the committee. Jeff Coleman was a member of that committee, and some of the legendary figures in the history of athletics. You will recall some of the announcers on the series and our sponsor was General Motors. The network was NBC. It all began in 1952 and I later became the announcer on the series, and I have not known to this day whether I got demoted or promoted. It is hard to say. (Laughter)

I was talking to a crusty old director of athletics last night and we were talking about the fact that things had changed so much in the field of intercollegiate athletics. The NCAA is aware of that because they have to face the problems that come about. I don't know. I recall the fact when I went to school in Tennessee, Bob Neyland was the director of athletics and he would be in for about 15 minutes a day. (Laughter) Of course, he wasn't concerned with ticket sales, promotion, television and women in athletics and all those things.

As a matter of fact if we had left it up to him, he wouldn't have sold tickets; he would have locked the gates and played the game in private. (Laughter) Times have changed. This fellow said, "Well, you know, back in those days we recruited for one sport, the revenue sport, football. We hoped some could play basketball and football. We sent the wide receivers and backs out for the track team, and we had our tackles and our fullbacks do the shot and the discus and that sort of thing. The women were in the Home Economics Department where they belong. You didn't have to worry about them wanting to play athletics. You put them in the kitchen."

He said, "If women are so smart, why do they dance backwards?" (Laughter) I am only kidding, ladies. Of course, I realize the frustration of educators. I guess that is best typified by the teacher that told the youngsters in the class to go home and figure out what their life's ambition is, put it in rhythm and recite it tomorrow.

The next day she called on this young boy to give his report. He said, "My name is Stan and when I grow up to be a man I would like to go to Japan." She said, that is fine. Then she asked for another volunteer. A little girl held up her hand. She said, "My name is Sadie and when I grow up to be a lady I would like to have a baby, if I can, I think I can." She said, that is fine.

One little guy had his hand up all the time but she was a little worried about calling on him because she had trouble with him right along. But nobody else volunteered so she called on him. He said, "My name is Dan, and when I grow up to be a man I don't want to go to Japan, I would like to help Sadie with her plan, if I can." (Laughter)



We, of course, are here for the purpose of honoring College Athletics' Top Ten. It is my pleasure to join you and your colleagues today and to share the dais with these outstanding student-athletes we honor, both past and present. This program will have a lasting impression upon the honorees, their families, friends and institutions, and I am pleased I have been given the opportunity to have a part in their day.

The NCAA began awarding \$1,000 postgraduate scholarships in 1964 to student-athletes who excelled in the classroom and in competition. The grant was increased to \$1,500 in the fall of 1975, and the Association has invested over \$1 million, \$1,073,500, in fact, in the further education of 977 student-athletes over the past 14 years. The 80 student-athletes awarded grants in 1977 are listed on the inside back cover of the program. It is an impressive list, and I encourage you to review it.

The chairman of the Postgraduate Scholarship Committee is Joe L. Singleton from the University of California, Davis.

Six years ago, the NCAA began recognizing the College Athletics' Top Ten. This program provides the Association the opportunity to salute the five outstanding student-athletes for the preceding calendar year; and five former lettermen who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions on their silver anniversary as college graduates.

The responsibility of choosing these honorees rests on the broad shoulders of the members of the Top Ten Selection Committee, who also are listed in your program. Each year the job becomes tougher. You will understand why when we present the 1977 College Athletics' Top Ten. The criteria for each of these categories are listed in your program. Please permit me to begin with the introduction of Today's Top Five.

Gentlemen, please rise and remain standing at your place when I call your name. Following a brief resumé of your collegiate career, please accept your award from Secretary-Treasurer Sherman at the dais on the lower tier.

Michael John Bourdeau, Randolph-Macon College, soccer and baseball. His institutional representative is head football coach Ted Keller.

When Mickey Bourdeau graduated with honors in mathematics and computer science at Randolph-Macon College last spring, he had accomplished goals in all areas of student life which will be a standard of comparison for those who will follow him.

While he was establishing a 3.74 grade point average with a dual major, Mickey also was earning varsity letters in two sports and becoming involved in a wide diversity of extracurricular activities.

A member of the Virginia all-star soccer team who earned all-state honors twice, he was the third leading scorer in the school's history, team co-captain twice and a four-year baseball letterman. He also participated in the National Collegiate Division II Soccer and Baseball Championships; and was awarded the George P. Compton Memorial Award for the athlete displaying outstanding leadership, sportsmanship, athletic ability and academic achievement.

A member of Phi Beta Kappa, Mickey also was president and pledge

master of Lambda Chi Alpha Fraternity, a class and student government officer, a member of the Honor and Judicial Councils, Varsity Club president and treasurer, and elected to Omicron Delta Kappa.

He received the Child's scholarship for academic achievement and potential as a leader and the Randolph-Macon Award for academic performance, promise, moral, leadership and general merit.

Mickey also actively assisted the admissions office with campus tours, and served as a dormitory advisor. He currently is employed by Texas Instruments in Dallas.

Ladies and gentlemen, Michael John Bourdeau, Randolph-Macon College.

Daniel Ross Mackesey, Cornell University, soccer and lacrosse. His institutional representative is Director of Athletics Dick Schultz.

Dan Mackesey, quite simply, is one of the most outstanding athletes who ever competed in intercollegiate lacrosse.

He led Cornell to two Ivy League and National Collegiate championships and twice was presented the Kelly award as the outstanding goalie in Division I. He set an NCAA record for saves in a championship game, had a shutout in postseason competition as a junior and captained the North squad in the North-South Game. He also was presented the Hero's Club Award as the outstanding collegiate goalie.

Dan also earned all-America recognition in soccer, where he led his team to a conference championship and to the quarterfinals of the National Collegiate Championship. The goalie had a .855 save percentage and allowed less than one goal per game. He was the team captain for three years.

An NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship honoree who established a 3.46 grade-point average majoring in anthropology, the University of Virginia Law School student also was the New York State Regents' Scholarship recipient at Cornell.

He was president of the Sports Advisory Council; elected to Quill and Dagger and Sphinx Head senior honoraries, and received the Marcham prize as the outstanding history department student.

Dan also participated in a Latin American development study group and was a member of the United States-Latin American Relations Committee. He also was a Rotary exchange student to Denmark and was awarded an ECAC Scholar-Athlete Merit Medal.

Ladies and gentlemen, Daniel Ross Mackesey, Cornell University.

John Phillips Naber, University of Southern California, swimming. His institutional representative is Director of Athletics Richard Perry.

John Naber's name became a household word throughout the world during the 1976 Olympic Games in Montreal, where he won four gold medals and one silver medal in swimming.

John's record in intercollegiate swimming will be surpassed by few individuals in the future. He led his team to four National Collegiate Championships, was the high-point man each year and he holds an all-time career record of 10 individual championships in NCAA competition.

He won three individual titles his freshman and sophomore seasons, two as a junior and senior and swam on five winning relay teams.

John also set world records in the 100- and 200-meter backstroke and swam on record-setting 400-meter medley and 800-meter freestyle relay teams. He was the World Male Swimmer of the Year in 1976 and placed second in the Sullivan award balloting.

A member of Skull and Dagger and Blue Key national honor fraternities, John established a 3.2 grade point average majoring in psychology and was a resident advisor for his dormitory.

An active member of the Portola Valley Presbyterian Church, he also is a Bible Study group leader, and a Pacific-8 Conference medal winner.

John has been a volunteer worker on behalf of the University of Southern California's Toward Century II National Development Committee. He currently is employed by Walt Disney Productions.

Ladies and gentlemen, John Phillips Naber, University of Southern California.

Gifford S. Nielsen, Brigham Young University, football. His institutional representative is Glen Tuckett, director of athletics.

Gifford Nielsen began the football season like a consensus all-America quarterback and a serious contender for the Heisman Trophy. He was leading the nation in all passing statistical categories and had directed his team to three straight wins before he sustained an injury in the fourth game, which ended his season. But he is so outstanding in many areas, so obvious a choice for this award, the Top Ten Committee was not influenced by his misfortune.

Giff was the Football Writers Association of America's all-America quarterback as a junior, leading the nation in touchdown passes, ranking second in total offense and passing yards and setting Western Athletic Conference records for pass completions, attempts, yards and touchdowns. He had 468 yards passing for five touchdowns against Utah State as a junior, and completed 30 of 40 passes for 321 yards and six touchdowns against that cross-state rival this fall.

Giff also was the team captain in football and a letterman in basketball. He earned a 3.1 grade-point average in public relations and communications, and participated in the NCAA-ABC football promotional tour in August.

He was the Honorary Grand Marshal for Brigham Young's homecoming festivities and was the master of ceremonies for the state-wide March of Dimes campaign. He speaks to youth groups an average of three times a week on behalf of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and teaches a Sunday school class for 14 and 15 year-olds.

The NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship winner is married and the father of one child.

Ladies and gentlemen, Gifford S. Nielsen, Brigham Young University.

Bryan Lee Rodgers, Delta State University, baseball. His institutional representative is Director of Athletics Bradford Hovious.

Few students who actively participate in extracurricular activities complete their undergraduate academic requirements with a perfect

4.00 grade-point average. But then, no one has ever suggested Bryan Rodgers was a typical student.

While never receiving any grade less than an "A" during his four years at Delta State University majoring in commercial design and art, Bryan's extracurricular responsibilities grew each year.

He was elected permanent president of his class and Omicron Delta Kappa. Bryan participated in the Delta Readers Drama Presentations and he was a member of Phi Kappa Phi.

He was the Gulf South Conference Athlete of the Year, and the first baseman established a .307 career batting average.

Bryan hit .345 as a senior, was a three-year recipient of the Dave Ferriss Sportsmanship Award and toured South America with the USA Sports Ambassadors.

He also was presented the Dean of the University Award for establishing the highest academic achievement, a member of the Wesley Foundation, an officer in the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, and listed in Who's Who in American Universities and Colleges.

An NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship honoree, Bryan is enrolled in the University of Mississippi Graduate School.

Ladies and gentlemen, Bryan Lee Rodgers, Delta State University.

Those are our Top Five honorees for today. Responding on their behalf is Gifford Nielsen.

**Gifford Nielsen** (Brigham Young University): Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great opportunity for me to respond on behalf of the honorees here today and I thank all of the NCAA throughout the country. The NCAA affords young men and women an opportunity to learn, and this last year I had a great opportunity to learn a valuable lesson.

During our fourth game of the season against Oregon State, I suffered a knee injury and I found out later that I would be lost for the rest of my collegiate career in football. I had a lot of things going for me—the possible Heisman Trophy, possibly repeated all-America honors, possible all-Conference honors. That was a tremendous loss for me.

But I could cope with that problem because I had a balance in my life. The NCAA encourages balance for young individuals. Not only are they excited about a young man or a young lady participating in athletics, they get excited about a young person getting involved scholastically, and I did have a balance. Today on behalf of the other honorees and all the NCAA participants, let me say "thank you" for providing athletic competition during college years, also realizing the need for a balance between athletic and scholastic endeavors for athletes.

Your encouragement for excellence on and off the field helps athletes in many ways, both seen and unseen. For this wisdom and the great honor bestowed upon the honorees today, we thank you very much.

**Mr. Nelson:** Thank you, Giff, and congratulations to you. I, as well as the others sharing this occasion with you, certainly look forward to

following each of your careers in the future. And now, we salute the Silver Anniversary honorees.

Gentlemen, please rise and remain standing at your place when I call your name. Following a brief resume of your collegiate and post-collegiate careers, please accept your award from Secretary-Treasurer Sherman.

W. Thane Baker, purchasing and transportation manager, Mobil Research and Development Corporation, Kansas State University, track. His institutional representative is Director of Athletics John Jermier.

World records usually are not associated with individuals who completed their intercollegiate competition 25 years ago, but Thane Baker's name again was entered on the ledger the past July when he ran a sub-10 second 100-yard dash and became the fastest man ever to cover the distance for ages 40-49.

But this accomplishment may not surprise many of you in the audience today who remember Mr. Baker earning a bronze medal in the 200-meter dash at the 1952 Olympics; or placing second in the 100-meter dash, third in the 200 and running a leg on the gold medal 4 x 100-meter relay in the 1956 Olympic Games.

He also won the sprints in the Big Eight Conference three consecutive years, and became the first sprinter to win three consecutive dash championships at the Kansas Relays. Mr. Baker had the fastest intercollegiate times in the world as a senior with a 9.4 in the 100-yard dash, a 20.4 in the 220 and a 47.1 in the 440. He set or tied eight world and/or American records from 60 to 300 yards between 1952 and 1956, and he completed his competition at Kansas State winning the national collegiate 220-yard dash championship.

A three-time all-America, he also was vice-president of the Student Council and a student representative on the Athletics Council.

Mr. Baker joined Mobil Oil Company following a short stint in the U.S. Air Force and served as the West coast purchasing agent in 1954 and 1955. He then received numerous assignments throughout the Southwest the next ten years before joining Mobil Research and Development Corporation in 1966. He currently is purchasing and transportation manager and is responsible for purchasing, accounting, the Catalog Center, and shipping and receiving at Mobil's World Research Center.

Mr. Baker was promoted to Colonel in the Air Force Reserve four years earlier than the average rank is obtained, and he is the commanding officer of the Dallas/Ft. Worth combined Military Selective Service Reserve Unit. He has received meritorious service awards from the Air Force Continental Air Command and the Selective Service System.

He also is a member of the Greater Dallas Planning Council and the Oak Cliff Chamber of Commerce; he is an observer for the Dallas Independent School District board meetings and serves on the Dallas County March of Dimes Board of Directors.

Mr. Baker also is a Ruling Elder in the United Presbyterian Church

and shoulders many committee responsibilities in addition to teaching a Sunday school class and serving as a lay preacher.

Ladies and gentlemen, W. Thane Baker, Kansas State University.

Dr. Andrew J. Kozar, executive assistant to the president, University of Tennessee, University of Tennessee football. His institutional representative is Director of Athletics Bob Woodruff.

Andy Kozar rapidly is establishing a reputation as one of the nation's outstanding academicians. Not only is he highly respected on the Knoxville campus where he is responsible for implementing the decisions of the president, but his work with the chancellors of the University of Tennessee's five primary campuses dealing with student problems, coordinating the University's Affirmative Action Program and directing institutional research continues to gain him national acclaim in higher education.

He also has become a leading authority on sports sculptures, and has been curator of the Joseph B. Wolfe Collection of R. Tait McKenzie Sculptures at the university since 1973.

Mr. Kozar's responsibilities in educational administration have covered a wide range, including assignments as coordinator of physical education and elementary physical education for the Ann Arbor, Michigan, Public School District; instructor and assistant professor at the University of Michigan and the University of Tennessee; coordinator of student teaching, and full professor and head of the Tennessee Men's School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

He was a two-time all-Southeastern Conference fullback for the Volunteers, but sustained an injury during his senior year which precluded all-America recognition. Kozar gained 1850 career yards for a 5.2 average, and had 660 yards for a 5.4 average in his senior year although injured. He currently ranks fourth in career rushing and sixth in scoring at Tennessee, was the most valuable player in the 1951 Cotton Bowl and was elected to the Cotton Bowl all-decade team.

Mr. Kozar was vice-president of Phi Sigma Kappa, the Key Club and received the distinguished Army ROTC Award as an undergraduate.

He was the National Masters paddleball champion in 1972, and was one of eight fellows elected by the American College of Sports Medicine in 1968.

His civic and professional contributions are far too many to enumerate, but several which deserve special attention include membership in Omicron Delta Kappa, his election to the Tennessee and National Football Foundation Halls of Fame, and his participation in the East Tennessee Heart Association.

Ladies and gentlemen, Andrew J. Kozar, University of Tennessee.

The Rev. Donn D. Moomaw, Senior Pastor, Bel Air Presbyterian Church, University of California, Los Angeles, football. His institutional representative is Director of Athletics J. D. Morgan.

Donn Moomaw always has typified an all-America image. During his undergraduate career at UCLA he earned Lineman- and Player-of-the-Year awards and was named one of the world's ten greatest athletes.

But equally important to Rev. Moomaw, he also was enjoying other social and educational outlets as a Dean of Students appointee to develop policy for the moral and ethical Student Conduct Code administered by the Student Judicial Board, serving on the Interfraternity Council Advisory Board through election to Blue Shield, and, most significantly, as a founding student member of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes.

Rev. Moomaw earned all-America honors following his sophomore season at UCLA, but he sustained a shoulder injury during his junior year which prevented him from receiving the recognition three consecutive years.

His image has been burnished during the past 25 years. He has been pastor of the 2,000-member Bel Air Presbyterian Church in Los Angeles since 1964, and conducts three services each Sunday—many are attended by standing room crowds—and supervises a staff of 28 and a \$2 million plant.

He was a minister-at-large for the Berkeley First Presbyterian Church speaking in high schools, colleges, and the armed forces, among other groups, for three-and-one-half years after serving the church as its pastor for five years.

Rev. Moomaw was a member of the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association Crusade in London, England, in 1954; and he regularly speaks at a variety of meetings throughout the nation. He presented Gov. Ronald Reagan's inauguration prayer.

His contributions to society beyond his ministry are numerous and varied. He is a member of the Fuller Theological Seminary Board of Trustees, the Basler Nursing Homes, and the Los Angeles Museum Alliance Board of Directors.

Rev. Moomaw also is a past president of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes; served on the President's Council on Physical Fitness in Sports and the California State Board of Education, and was the youngest man ever inducted into the National Football Foundation's Hall of Fame at the time of his selection.

Ladies and gentlemen, Donn D. Moomaw, UCLA.

Lowell W. Perry, director of personnel, United States Automotive Manufacturing Group, University of Michigan, football. His institutional representative is Director of Athletics Don Canham.

Lowell Perry's athletic success at the University of Michigan has been paralleled by his progression through the corporate structure of one of America's largest automotive conglomerates.

He was a consensus all-America end for the Wolverines, and he recently has been named the director of personnel for the United States Automotive Manufacturing Group, a subsidiary of Chrysler Corporation.

His name remains prominent in the Michigan football record book; he had 71 receptions for 1,261 yards and 10 touchdowns, and 41 punt returns during his career. An honor student, he was a member of Michigamua senior honorary society.

Following his graduation, he spent two years in the U. S. Air Force

and was a player, coach and professional football scout at Pittsburgh the next four years while also earning his Doctorates of Law from Ferris State College and Wilberforce University.

He was a Federal judge law clerk and then became an attorney for the National Labor Relations Board investigating unfair labor charges and representation petitions throughout Michigan before joining Chrysler Corporation in 1963.

Mr. Perry began moving up the corporate ladder as a personnel executive in the Automobile Sales Group, became the corporate staff labor relations representative and later the section manager for Chrysler's hourly Labor Relations.

He then became a member of the Chrysler national contract bargaining team, served two years as personnel manager for the Chrysler Basic Manufacturing Division and was plant manager of Chrysler Universal in Dearborn four years before he accepted his current assignment.

Mr. Perry also devotes much of his time to assisting his fellow man. He is chairman of the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and serves on the United States Marine Corps Commandant's Advisory Committee on Minority Affairs.

He also is a member of the Detroit College of Law Board of Trustees, and has served in a similar capacity for Ferris State College.

Mr. Perry has served on the State Bar of Michigan Labor Law Council, and is a member of the United Foundation and Boys Clubs of Greater Detroit Boards of Directors, and the University of Michigan Detroit Club Board of Governors.

Ladies and gentlemen, Lowell W. Perry, University of Michigan.

Cecil J. Silas, vice-president, Natural Resources Group, Phillips Petroleum Company, Georgia Institute of Technology, basketball. His institutional representative is Director of Athletics Doug Weaver.

Pete Silas' rise to the vice-presidency of the Phillips Petroleum Company has not been an accident. It has been the result of the many hours he has devoted to the company since accepting a job as a trainee following graduation from Georgia Tech.

His success, though, really is not a surprise. He was an all-Southeastern Conference basketball performer and was the first Tech athlete ever to score more than 1,000 points during his career. He also set a season scoring record and a single-game high with 39 points against Furman. He captained the team, and participated in the East-West All-Star Shrine Game and on the gold medal team in the 1955 Pan American Games.

Mr. Silas' campus activities virtually overshadowed his athletic accomplishments. He was vice-president of the Student Council, Student Trial Board chairman, Omicron Delta Kappa, Phi Delta Theta, ROTC Chemical Corps Battalion Cadet Colonel, the Outstanding ROTC Graduate and was listed in Who's Who Among American Colleges and Universities.

Mr. Silas currently is responsible for natural gas purchases and sales in gas liquids development, helium and sulfur sales, liquefied natural gas

sales and development and all Federal Power Commission regulatory matters for Phillips Petroleum. He has held a variety of positions, including plastic engineer in the Bartlesville Sales Service Laboratory; international department sales engineer in New York City; manager of plastics, technical services and sales for Europe and Asia; and general manager of Phillips Petroleum International in France.

He also was president of Phillips' Europe-Africa Division, and was managing director of the body which augmented a major restructuring of the company into three worldwide business lines—Natural Resources Group, Petroleum Products Group and Chemicals Group. Mr. Silas also coordinated the development of the Norwegian Ekofisk Project which included seven oil/gas fields, a 220-mile oil pipeline to the United Kingdom and a 268-mile pipeline to Emden, Germany.

He has been awarded the Royal Norwegian St. Olav Order in the degree of Commander for his contribution in developing energy and allied industries in Norway, by King Olav. He is a member of the Bartlesville Rotary Club, and has been inducted into the Georgia Tech Athletic Hall of Fame.

Ladies and gentlemen, Cecil J. Silas, Georgia Institute of Technology.

Those are our five Silver Anniversary honorees. Responding on their behalf is Rev. Donn Moomaw.

**Rev. Moomaw:** Thank you very much, Lindsey, and all of you present. It is very difficult to speak for others at a time like this when the emotions run high. The really difficult thing or the humiliating thing is to be identified with these four old men that are here with me. (Laughter) I am reminded of the old fellow that went cruising through the center of town in his car and the highway patrolman picked up chase, pulled him over to the side of the road on the outskirts of town. The officer of the law jumped off his motorcycle, ran around to the side of the car and began to chew the fellow out for his wreckless driving.

He noticed a jug beside the driver. He said, "What is in the jug?" The old fellow said, "Well, that is water, sir. I needed it to travel around. I am a traveling salesman and I need this water as I go." The officer said, "Let me smell the bottle." He handed it to him. The officer said, "That is not water, that is wine."

The old boy said, "Praise the Lord, he has done it again." (Laughter) Some of you are not laughing and have not been in Sunday school for a long time, I see. (Laughter) But, you know, I want to say "Praise the Lord, he has done it again." This really is a gift from God to me and I know it is to the guys.

This is the kind of thing that represents so much more than may be obvious. We never like to be recognized for what we used to be. I just recently was in the airport in Los Angeles, and a lady came up to me and said, "Oh, oh, didn't you used to be Donn Moomaw?" I said, "Yes. Fortunately, I still am." (Laughter) We like to be known by what we are today and this recognition is, of course, recognition, in fact, that something has happened since those days when we were athletes at our respective universities, and we trust we have in a humble way moved on to some other achievements.

I am reminded, too, of the great tale when the Master was meeting in the room and the room in which he was speaking was crowded. Some men had a concern about a paralytic, and four of them grabbed the corners of the paralytic's bed and came to the place where Jesus was. They couldn't get in. So they made a hole in the roof.

You know the story. They dropped the paralytic man at the very feet of Jesus. The story is that Jesus saw their faith, the faith of the four, and said to the man on the pallet, "Thy sins be forgiven. Go and be well." He was healed immediately. As I look back over my university career and the many influences since that time, I know there are many people who have grabbed the corner of my bed and who have helped me to any achievement or any recognition which has come in my direction.

I am very grateful for a long-suffering and patient and loving mother and father who, of course, must be recognized as the first group that grabbed the corner of the bed. Their constant and continual support and affirmation in those rough transitional days from high school to the University of California in Los Angeles, is, of course, very much a beautiful memory to me as I know it is to these other recipients on the other side. I thank God for those that grabbed the corner of my bed from my university, those in coaching and the trainers, the players that I was associated with at UCLA.

Red Sanders was my coach. I thank God for Red Sanders who demanded excellence. I think in some ways the influence that he had, even though in his own personal life maybe he didn't demand the excellence that he needed to there, but he demanded it of me. He drove me to think through what I was living for. He drove me to think through that my life is a lot more than winning football games. I will never forget the assistance that he has given me.

Help must come from someone that created us. I am grateful for Red Sanders, Billy Barnes, Jim Meyers, George Dickerson and the other coaches there. One coach in particular who was an up and coming young tennis coach named J. D. Morgan, I say thanks to him. I am very grateful for what they did for me at UCLA and are continuing to do for me.

I am also appreciative of the university itself, a great university with a great tradition, which you might say grabbed another corner of the bed, who took a chance on me because I didn't have the greatest high school transcript, and supported me through that great time, the four years I was at the university.

Then the other corner of the bed, of course, I am very grateful to the National Collegiate Athletic Association who helped bring me to a place of achievement. I know that it is sometimes difficult to thank a large monolithic institution like the NCAA, but they very much contributed to the healing of my life. Because they gave me an opportunity to meet some of the finest young men that any guy would ever want to meet, and since that time to be associated through things like the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, through things like my association on the Physical Fitness and Sports Committee and to have an added opportunity to support programs of which you are concerned.

To think that you fellows, you people, you women, give us opportu-



nity in the business of our lives, in the stretch of our difficult world situations to let the little child come out in us on a Saturday afternoon or a Friday night or Thursday night, and become children again and work together for a silly thing like a competition in collegiate athletics, and yet something that is very real and very celebrated.

As a matter of fact, at one time an important person said, "If the spirit had his way with the church, there would be nothing left but Jesus and dancing." I think we need a lot more celebration today. I appreciate the NCAA giving us this opportunity not only to compete and to become a part of the actual sweat and blood of competition, but also to be able to enter vicariously in our athletics and the athletes themselves. It is something beyond my comprehension.

Yes, I would say with the old man on the side of the road, "Praise God, he has done it again, and again, and again, and again." For the recipients of this beautiful most distinctive award, I want to thank you all that made it possible, especially our universities for nominating us. God bless you, men. He has done it again.

**Mr. Nelson:** Now, J. Neils Thompson of the University of Texas at Austin and the president of the NCAA, will present the Association's highest honor, the Theodore Roosevelt Award.

**President Thompson:** Before making this presentation, I can't help but pause to say that the presentations you have just now heard have made my body tingle and I am thrilled at the fact that we are recognizing such worthy individuals. I hope you will join me again in giving this group a tremendous hand. The last presentation made an impact in the fact there is a heart and a real feeling for the NCAA.

The focal point of this occasion always is presentation of the prestigious Theodore Roosevelt Award. It annually is presented to a former letterman at a member institution "for whom competitive athletics in college and attention to physical well-being thereafter have been important factors in a distinguished career of national significance."

You may wish to refer to your program to review the list of distinguished gentlemen who have received the Teddy award in the past, and today's honoree certainly meets the high standards set by his predecessors.

Like many of the former Teddy winners, he bypassed a promising athletic career after graduation to begin his quest for a rewarding business career.

He was an outstanding athlete at the University of Rochester earning three varsity letters in football, basketball and baseball. He signed a professional baseball contract with the St. Louis Cardinals following his graduation in 1937 and was assigned to the Rochester Red Wings. The minor league team played the parent club in an exhibition game a few weeks later, and our honoree entered the game as a relief pitcher in the second inning and held St. Louis hitless for eight innings.

But one of the biggest decisions in Gerald Zornow's life was turning his back on that promising career in baseball to accept an invitation from Eastman Kodak to become one of 12 trainees. He readily admitted

he did not know anything about cameras, but he learned in a hurry.

Zornow joined Eastman Kodak in December and his first assignment was in the time office and cost accounting department at Kodak Park. Two months later, he was transferred to Eastman Kodak Stores in Cincinnati, and the next year he was named manager of the Kodak Exhibit at the New York World's Fair.

He returned to Kodak Park for further training and was transferred to Chicago as a medical division demonstrator in 1941. He served four years in the United States Marine Corps during World War II, and then returned to the windy city as a salesman.

A short time later in 1946, he was transferred to the New York City Sales Branch and served as manager five years before becoming head of the Pacific Northern Sales Division in San Francisco in 1952.

Zornow returned to the Rochester Headquarters two years later as the assistant general sales manager of the sales staff before being appointed director of sales for the newly formed Apparatus and Optical Division in 1956. Two years later, he was elected a company vice-president.

Zornow became responsible for sales and advertising in 1959, was appointed vice-president in charge of marketing in 1963, and, a few months later, he became a director of the company and a member of the Executive Committee.

He was elected vice-president in November, 1969, and, six months later, he was named president of the company and chairman of the Executive Committee. He was selected the chairman of the Board of Directors in May, 1972.

Mr. Zornow relinquished his chairmanship of the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors January 1 of last year, but he still retains a position on the Board of Directors.

His contributions to intercollegiate athletics and the nation's international amateur sports movement have been numerous, but I do want to mention a few to you.

He received the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame's coveted Gold Medal Award in 1974, and he chaired President Gerald R. Ford's 1976 Commission on Olympic Sports.

In 1976, he was presented the Amos Alonzo Stagg Award by the American Football Coaches Association. It annually is presented to "The individual, group or institution whose services have been outstanding in the advancement of the best interests of football."

Ladies and gentlemen, I take great pleasure in presenting to you the 1978 Teddy winner, Gerald B. Zornow, University of Rochester. Mr. Zornow.

**Gerald B. Zornow:** Thank you, Neils. Father Warner, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: After the eloquence that you have heard here over the past half-hour or so, I am a little reluctant to say anything. Even to say that I am both flattered and very humbled to receive the Theodore Roosevelt Award from the NCAA would be a vast understatement.

When I learned of this great honor, I also learned that it would be

appreciated if I could be present to receive it. Now, as you know, I am from upstate New York. The average snowfall in Rochester during January is just under two feet. Let me tell you, it is very difficult to make long putts in January in Rochester. So I would have been here even if I hadn't won the Teddy award, if for nothing else than to enjoy more favorable January putting conditions!

I should add that even good weather sometimes doesn't help. I said that I was both flattered and humbled to be honored by the NCAA. The humility stems partly from the list of past recipients of this award. To have the honor to be listed among such eminent Americans is indeed humbling.

I suspect that in a significant way, my role as chairman of President Ford's Commission on Olympic Sports was a factor in selecting me for this honor from among so many who are deserving, many perhaps more than I. So in receiving the Teddy award, I do so on behalf of the 23 commissioners who worked so hard for a year-and-a-half to produce an analytical report on our amateur sports situation, especially as it relates to Olympic participation.

The commissioners deserve recognition for their efforts, and if I may, I would like to tell you who they were, since many are no doubt known to you. You will recognize the name of Dr. Jerome Holland. Brud is a former Teddy award winner, and made a particularly meaningful contribution to the commission through his insight and common-sense approach to athletics.

Joining Dr. Holland on the commission were former Olympians Donna DeVarona, Willye White, Michael Elliott, Captain Micki King Hogue, Rafer Johnson and Bill Toomey. From the school and college community came Barbara Forker and James McCain. Other interested and knowledgeable Americans were added . . . Bud Wilkinson, Ernie Vandeweghe, Lamar Hunt, and the distinguished Howard K. Smith. They joined four senators and four congressmen selected from both major political parties.

If the foregoing sounds a little like a list of "Who's Who In American Sports," then I am pleased, because I believe they add credence to the commission's recommendations. I believe the commission, along with a dedicated staff, followed the Presidential charge that we objectively evaluate the problems in amateur American sports, not to point the finger of blame, but to suggest ways to help cure whatever ills exist.

The commissioners also collectively decided that their recommendations should ensure that our international and olympic teams be at least as well equipped as the Outer Mongolians . . . at least as well housed as senior citizens . . . at least as well uniformed as the Dallas Cowgirls . . . and at least as well-coached as a high school valedictorian.

Many long hours were spent in deliberating a number of issues, and scores of involved individuals and groups appeared before the commission. I am reminded of the old adage, "It is better to have all of the questions than some of the answers."

When I was preparing these remarks, I promised myself I would avoid assuming a soapbox stance, but most of my life has been devoted to marketing, so I would be a poor salesman if I didn't use today's forum to

advance one or two beliefs.

First, I do not believe in the "shake-the-tree" theory. That is the one that says you can shake the tree of amateur athletics every four years and have a John Naber, a Horace Ivory or a Dorothy Hamill fall out. If we are going to play the game, let's plan to win, even if the planning takes four years.

Secondly, we all recognize a basic truth, that college athletes only benefit from the excellent advice and guidance of the NCAA for a brief four years. My congratulations for the great job you do during those four years.

But let's recognize that those four years are vital ones in the development of athletes, many of whom reach their peak during their intercollegiate days. The school college community has continually supplied Olympic medal winners from its reservoir of athletic excellence. To see that supply diminish or disappear due to organizational or jurisdictional disputes would break faith with American athletes and the American people.

And finally, to have our Olympic effort to go forward without the participation of the school-college athletic community would be analogous to trying to win a football game without a quarterback. Our national teams simply cannot be effectively competitive and fully representative without the 100 per cent cooperation of all of us.

If I leave you with no other thought today, it is to urge the NCAA to give favorable consideration to your International Relations Committee's recommendation for renewed enthusiastic participation in the United States Olympic Committee, and to take the lead in helping the USOC continue to restructure itself to be fully effective and successful.

In closing, I would like to again thank the NCAA for this great honor and express the hope that the one big athletic director in heaven will bless you all, and the young people to whom you have devoted your lives. Thank you very much.

**President Thompson:** Thank you, Mr. Zornow, on that wonderful response. He did refer to the University of Rochester, and we are delighted at this time to present this institutional plaque to W. Allen Wallis, chancellor of the University of Rochester, commemorating the selection of one of its distinguished alumni as the recipient of the 1978 Theodore Roosevelt Award.

**Mr. Nelson:** This has been a marvelous affair, I think you all will agree. I want to congratulate each of the honorees. The examples presented by these men should reiterate to each of us the importance of athletics in our society, and their accomplishments should make you, the educators, administrators and coaches responsible for the meaningful role athletics has in higher education, very proud.

It has been a great opportunity for me yesterday and today, and I hope tomorrow to renew great relationships. As far as I am concerned, had there not been the intercollegiate athletics, I wouldn't have gotten an education of any kind. The most important thing to me have been the people I have been able to meet in the context of NCAA athletics, because after all that is where I met you. Thank you very much.

**President Thompson:** Lindsey, it was a pleasure to have you here, and come back and visit with us. You have added so much to this occasion. On behalf of the NCAA, I should like to present you a small memento of this occasion because we want you to come back some more.

**President Thompson:** With that, I should like to call for Father Warner to present to you our Benediction.

**Father Warner:** May the grace, power and the love of Almighty God be with you and keep you and those whom you love this day and always. Amen.

## GENERAL ROUND TABLE

Wednesday Afternoon, January 11, 1978

The general round table convened at 3 p.m. in the Peachtree Ballroom, Edgar A. Sherman, NCAA secretary-treasurer, Muskingum College, presiding.

**Secretary-Treasurer Sherman:** Welcome to the general round table. Our round table discussion covers four subjects. They are championship funding, enforcement policies and procedures, divisional membership criteria and discussion of other proposed legislation.

Each of the subjects will have its own panel members. It is our plan to have the panel of each of the subjects come to the platform for their assignments. They will make their presentation, after which we will allow time for questions. We would ask if you have a question that you approach the microphone, give your name, your school, for the benefit of the recorder.

We also would suggest that if you have a question, that you work yourself toward a microphone in order to save time. The first item at this afternoon's round table is discussion of the NCAA championship funding program.

Today two of my fellow Executive Committee Members, J. D. Morgan and Ed Steitz, will discuss the program. Afterwards, we will attempt to answer any question that you may have. The first speaker is J. D. Morgan, Director of Athletics at UCLA.

**J. D. Morgan** (University of California, Los Angeles): It is my job here today to quickly do a recollection of how this has developed and bring us up to where we are at the present time. Insofar as I have been able to determine, the concept of guaranteeing expense payments to the institutions for the participation of the student-athletes and teams in NCAA championships first was discussed in the Football Committee meetings in the fall of 1972.

A chairman of that group and the man whose guiding hand seems to have brought us to the position that we are today was Ed Sherman. In those days, the committee discussed using revenue in College Division football and basketball championships to defray a portion of transportation expense incurred by College Division members in other sports.

At that time, nearly all surplus Association funds were committed to reducing the mortgage on the national office building. The final mortgage payment was made in October 1976, thereby clearing funds to be used for championship expenses. In August 1975, the Executive Committee asked the Television Committee, under the chairmanship of Seaver Peters from Dartmouth College, to incorporate into the 1976-77 Football Television Plan a provision which would guarantee payment of most transportation expenses for teams and individual player winners in the NCAA championships.



The Executive Committee then would determine whether sufficient funds could be secured for this purpose through the television assessments and other sources. In December 1975, the officers set aside \$100,000 in excess receipts to establish a reserve fund, with the first payment to be made during the 1976-77 academic year.

At its January 1976 meeting, the Executive Committee estimated sufficient funds might be available to guarantee 60 per cent of team travel only. The Executive Committee agreed the first consideration should be given to payment of team expenses rather than those of competitors in individual events.

This decision was based upon the belief that the participation in an NCAA championship by an institution's team as opposed to one or two individual competitors, places a greater strain on an athletic director's travel budget. It also is for this reason that we limited our initial payments in individual events to medal winners.

In August 1976, the Executive Committee allocated \$700,000 from the 1976-77 general operating budget to the transportation reserve. To further aid the championships program and return even more money to the membership, the committee directed that certain administrative expenses—awards, telephone and staff travel, for example—should be charged to either the divisional reserve fund or the events department budget, as appropriate.

Using its best estimates, the Executive Committee voted to begin the program with a guarantee of 80 per cent of transportation costs for teams and individual award medal winners for the 1976-77 academic year. Taking a conservative approach, the committee initially applied the guarantee only to those championships which did not produce enough revenue to pay the expenses of the participants.

During the recently concluded academic year, approximately \$300,000 was expended from the reserves for transportation guarantees and another \$200,000 was spent for administrative expenses. While noting a substantial surplus from operations for the fiscal year, the Executive Committee voted this past August to guarantee 100 per cent of transportation costs for teams and individual medal winners, regardless of whether the championship produces revenue.

This provision aids even those championships which traditionally have paid their own way in that it makes available for distribution to competing teams monies which previously had to be used to pay transportation expenses.

In team sports, each institution must submit a team institutional report to the NCAA national office. These reports are checked and verified to ensure accuracy. Occasionally, transportation or per diem claims are reduced by the national office staff. The per diem is paid according to the specifications in the handbook of that particular sport. Our NCAA staff attempts to have a check on its way to you within 30 days after receipt of your expense report.

Formerly, as many of you know, team expense reports were held until all reports for a particular championship had been received. Then payment was made to all participants at one time. The newly installed

computer in the national office has enabled us to process expense claims more quickly.

In individual championships the NCAA staff determines, through use of airline guides and local travel agencies, the amount of money due each institution. You are not required to submit any information in order to receive the expense check for your athletes' participation.

The success of the NCAA and the popularity of its programs, fostered by the member institutions, have resulted in this full-funding program which represents certainly, in my opinion, one of the most dramatic benefits ever provided the members of this Association. I think this is especially true for those in Division II and Division III.

**Secretary-Treasurer Sherman:** The next speaker is Ed Steitz, director of athletics at Springfield College. He represents Division II on the Executive Committee. Ed has been in Springfield for 32 years, 21 of them as director of athletics. Ed also serves the Association as editor of the basketball rules, a post he has held for 12 years.

**Edward Steitz (Springfield College):** My presentation will explain the Executive Committee's plans for the future and also attempt to acquaint you with some of the problems we foresee in the championships funding program.

As stated previously, the Association is paying, from its reserves, transportation expenses for teams and individual medal winners for all championships except indoor track during the 1977-78 academic year. The indoor track championships will be added to the program in 1978-79. The following comments also assume we will have a Division II hockey championship in 1979, making a total of 40 championships to be covered.

There is also the possibility that we will have three women's championships in Division II. I am sure you are wondering where the money will come from for this gigantic program. The answer is primarily from two sources: the football television assessments and the Division I basketball championship.

The NCAA Television Committee successfully negotiated a four-year agreement with ABC Sports in the amount of \$118 million, averaging \$19½ million per year for the four years. The Executive Committee has affixed the television assessment at eight per cent of this amount.

In 1978-79 and 1979-80, this will amount to more than \$2 million with a minimum of \$1 million to be used for championship travel. It is further anticipated that the Association's share of the net receipts from the Division I basketball championship will be \$3 million.

If you will refer, please, to the yellow sheet on the table [see box on page 69] that you received when you came in the room, you will see the costs of the various segments of transportation. This is based on the number of student-athletes who competed in the 1976-77 championships. The amounts to be paid in each division are divided in four categories.

The first category, teams, indicates the number of athletes and their projected expenses in the sports of baseball, basketball, football,

hockey, lacrosse, soccer, volleyball and water polo. The second category, medal winners, represents those student-athletes who received official NCAA awards in the sports of cross country, fencing, golf, gymnastics, skiing, swimming, track and field and wrestling.

The third category, other competitors, includes those athletes in the individual championships who competed in the meet or tournament, but did not place high enough to receive an official award. The fourth category, administration expenses, are those costs absorbed by the events department budget for reserve funds included but not limited to awards, telephone, and expenses of those institutions who serve as host to deficit events.

In 1978-79, there will be a change in the procedure relating to payment of expenses for athletes competing in individual championships. At the site, each institutional representative will be given an expense form on which he will have to list the names of the athletes who competed. This form must be filed with the national office in order for the institution to receive its reimbursement.

This procedure, then, is similar to that used in the team support. I call your attention to the category other competitors expenses. More than one-third of the projected \$3 million, approximately \$1.2 million, will be spent on athletes who do not earn official awards. The Executive Committee is extremely concerned about this segment of the program, because of its volatility.

A drastic rise in participation could result in reduced payments in subsequent years due to a lack of funds. Accordingly, the Executive Committee has appointed a subcommittee, with J. D. Morgan as chairman, to study the various individual championships, consult with the appropriate governing bodies' sports committees and make recommendations which will keep the number of entries in these events within manageable limits while not unduly restricting the opportunity of qualified student-athletes to compete for the national championships.

Your first reaction may be, what is wrong with having a few more competitors in the swimming championship? For example, just five additional athletes per event in the Division I swimming championships would cost an additional \$30,000. Therefore, it is imperative that the Executive Committee place restrictions on the number of entries in each sport in order to control our expenditures.

Since transportation and per diem expenses will be paid from the Association's reserve funds rather than charged against receipts of the tournament, a larger amount of money will be divided among member institutions which compete in the various events. The exact amount is difficult to determine at this time. Based upon the 1976-77 year numbers, it seems probable and highly likely that an additional \$500,000 will be distributed to the membership in this manner.

The officers and the Executive Committee are extremely pleased to be able to advance such a program and pledge our every effort to meeting these commitments.

**Projected Costs of Funding Transportation and Per Diem Expenses for Teams, Individual Medal Winners and Other Competitors in 1978-79 NCAA Championships**

Division I				
	No. Athletes	Transportation	Per Diem	Total
Teams	2,099	\$ 364,600	\$229,600	\$ 594,200
Medal Winners	698	144,300	47,700	192,000
Other Competitors	2,425	509,100	120,800	629,900
Administration				103,400
Total Division I	5,222	\$1,018,000	\$398,100	\$1,519,500
Division II				
Teams	2,019	\$ 287,800	\$183,300	\$ 471,100
Medal Winners	397	80,400	25,500	105,900
Other Competitors	1,172	225,400	46,800	272,200
Administration				84,600
Total Division II	3,588	\$ 593,600	\$255,600	\$ 933,800
Division III				
Teams	1,470	\$ 114,300	\$108,400	\$ 222,700
Medal Winners	355	54,200	22,900	77,100
Other Competitors	1,493	228,500	55,400	283,900
Administration				63,000
Total Division III	3,318	\$ 397,000	\$186,700	\$ 646,700
GRAND TOTAL	12,128			\$3,100,000

**Secretary-Treasurer Sherman:** The next subject that we will be discussing in our round table involves the Committee on Infractions. Members of the committee are participating in today's general round table in order to discuss the Association's enforcement policies and procedures.

As you know, Proposal No. 161 in the Convention Program relates to this subject and includes a statement of the operating guidelines, policies and procedures established by the Committee on Infractions and approved by the NCAA Council. These operating policies and procedures supplement the official procedure governing the NCAA enforcement program which is included in the NCAA Manual.

The panel includes Arthur Reynolds, Charles Alan Wright and W. L. Matthews. Harry M. Cross and John Sawyer are members of the committee and also are present today to assist in responding to any questions that you may have concerning the Association's enforcement policies and procedures. Art Reynolds is the chairman and will discuss the development of the NCAA enforcement program.

Mr. Wright will review the committee's established policies and procedures, and Mr. Matthews will discuss the distinction between administrative and legal procedures. After they have completed their presentation, it is hoped that you will feel free to ask these gentlemen any questions you may have concerning the conduct of the Association's enforcement policies.

Besides being the dean of the Graduate School of the University of Northern Colorado, Mr. Reynolds also is a professor of history. He is the immediate past president of the Western Association of Graduate

Schools, and he still serves on that organization's Executive Committee.

He also has served as chairman of the University of Northern Colorado's Board of Athletic Control for 20 years and is a former member of the NCAA Council.

Mr. Wright is a professor of law at the University of Texas, Austin, and has written a number of books pertaining to the legal field, primarily related to federal practice and procedure. He is a member of the Council and of the American Law Institute. From 1964 to 1976, he was on the Standing Committee on Rules, Practice and Procedure, of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Mr. Wright served on the University of Texas Athletic Council from 1966 to 1971, and he has been a member of the Committee on Infractions since 1973.

Mr. Matthews is a professor of law at the University of Kentucky. He served as acting Dean and Dean of the University of Kentucky College of Law for sixteen years, and has been the University Alumni Professor since 1974. He is a former member of the Kentucky Public Service Commission and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

Mr. Matthews has been the University of Kentucky's faculty athletic representative since 1962, and began his service on the Committee on Infractions in 1974.

**Arthur Reynolds** (University of Northern Colorado): First, I would like to ask two of my colleagues on the committee who are not on the stage but at the front table to stand and take a bow so that you will know who they are.

First, there is Harry Cross, professor of law and associate dean of the Law School of the University of Washington, and a former president of the NCAA.

Sitting next to Harry is John Sawyer, professor of mathematics and computer science at Wake Forest University.

As I have said a moment ago, Charlie Wright and W. L. Matthews will speak on two other topics in just a minute. Before they speak, I wish to review with you the history of the NCAA enforcement program, walk you through an infractions case, and emphasize to you the cooperative feature of the Association's enforcement effort.

It is most appropriate that this round table is held at the 1978 Convention, because it was just thirty years ago at the 1948 Convention that the membership adopted the so-called Sanity Code and created a Constitutional Compliance Committee which was the forerunner of your present Committee on Infractions.

New developments in the post-World War II years, such as professional gambling on college games, new and different emphasis on financial aids, expanded air transportation, which encouraged inter-sectional scheduling and transcontinental recruiting, and the rapid increase in postseason football games forced the NCAA to enter the rules enforcement arena.

Athletic competition became national in scope rather than local.

Traditional agreements and loosely written regulations which had controlled local and conference competition in the past were no longer sufficient. From this modest beginning in 1948, the enforcement program rapidly expanded and developed.

This development has not been destroyed of agonizing birth pains nor halting transitional stages, but the major objective of improving the athletics has remained constant through the years. Following revision of the enforcement procedures by the 1954 Convention, the Council appointed the first Committee on Infractions and charged it to investigate alleged violations of NCAA rules, determine if violations had occurred and propose penalties to be imposed on the involved institutions.

At the same time, the Association employed an assistant to the executive director, whose duties were to include work in the field of enforcement. This staff member, and others who were added as the burden of enforcement increased, served as an arm of the Committee on Infractions to conduct investigations. Prior to January 1973 the NCAA Council automatically received the committee's findings of violations and permitted an appearance by the institution which allegedly violated the NCAA rules.

The Council then made final the findings of violation, if any, and imposed an appropriate penalty. Because the hearing of cases became time-consuming for the Council and because there were indications from the membership that the initial role of the Committee on Infractions of investigating, prosecuting and fact-finding was not fair, the Council, the committee and a conference of conferences spearheaded the proposal of amendments at the 1973 Convention to materially change the enforcement procedures.

These new procedures provided that the NCAA investigative staff serve as the investigative arm and the administrative prosecutor of infractions cases; and that the Committee on Infractions provide general supervision over policies and procedures employed by the investigative staff and, following appropriate appearance by the involved institution, be the initial fact finder and imposer of penalties.

If the committee makes a finding of violations and imposes a penalty, the member institution may appeal the findings of violations, the penalty or both to the Council. The Council becomes the appellate hearing body, only considers infractions cases on appeal. You will find the official procedure governing the NCAA enforcement program as approved and adopted by the Council and Convention in the 1977-78 NCAA Manual.

These procedures are published in each year's Manual, and Bylaw 7-5-(b) provides that the procedures may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a majority vote. I emphasize that. If there is anything about the procedures that are not appropriate, it is up to the membership to propose amendments and changes on the same. Let me quickly walk you through the processing of an infractions case.

Whenever allegations are made or information develops which suggests that violations may have occurred, the institution is notified that a preliminary inquiry into its athletic policies and practices is

being made under the Association's enforcement procedure, and that a field investigator will check on the matter.

If the preliminary inquiry develops that there is adequate evidence to warrant opening an official inquiry, the enforcement staff reports the general scope of the matter under investigation to the committee. If the committee thinks the allegations are of a substantial nature, the committee authorizes the staff to submit an official inquiry to the president of the institution.

On the other hand if the field investigator, during his preliminary investigation, finds no substance to the allegations the enforcement staff closes the case, so notifies the university and reports to the committee. In the official inquiry, the member institution is provided sufficient specific information, including names, dates and places concerning each allegation to enable the institution to investigate and respond in an enlightened manner.

The enforcement procedure is a cooperative venture between the enforcement staff and the institution. The procedure is designed to give both sides the maximum opportunity to investigate alleged violations and report the results of their investigations to the Committee on Infractions for judging.

Let me emphasize that the only information the committee members have had in regard to the case, prior to the university's hearing, is the official inquiry and the university's response to the official inquiry. The committee usually requests that the university be represented at the hearing by specific principals in the case, but it is only a request because the committee does not have subpoena power.

When the university hearing occurs, its representatives usually include involved student-athletes, coaches, administrative officials and the conference commissioner. Appropriate legal counsel usually appear on behalf of each. At the hearing, the committee goes through the official inquiry and the university's response on an item by item basis. The enforcement staff expands on each allegation.

The university either admits that the alleged violations occurred or expands on its statement of denial. There is often an exchange of questions and answers among the three groups involved: the enforcement staff, the university's representatives and the members of the infractions committee.

I should mention that in presenting information and evidence for consideration by the committee, the enforcement staff can present only information which can be attributed to individuals who are willing to be identified. Following the item-by-item analysis of the allegations, both the institutional spokesman and the enforcement staff are given an opportunity to make a brief summary statement.

This concludes the institutional hearing. The institutional representatives and enforcement staff are dismissed from the hearing room, and the members of the infractions committee deliberate privately as they give thorough and judicious consideration to all of the written and oral information presented by the university, on the one hand, and the NCAA enforcement staff on the other.

The committee decides what, if any, violations of the NCAA Rules

occurred and notifies the university of its findings. The university has 15 days to decide whether to accept the committee's decisions or to appeal those decisions to the NCAA Council. At the Council hearing, the university's representatives present their case and I, as chairman of the infractions committee, with the help of the enforcement staff, presents the committee's findings and penalty.

The Council may accept the findings and penalty or make its own. Sometimes the penalties imposed include a show-cause provision. This provision states that the institution must show cause why an additional penalty shall not be imposed if, in the opinion of the committee, the institution does not take appropriate disciplinary or collective action against coaches or representatives of the university's athletic interests.

Let me emphasize that the committee and the Council, throughout the processing of the case, protects every procedural interest of the institution and its representatives. Special attention is given to assure that no action taken is arbitrary, capricious or discriminatory.

Beginning at the 1973 annual Convention, the membership demonstrated its desire to enforce fully the NCAA rules and regulations by authorizing a major expansion in the investigative staff and by encouraging the imposition of penalties on the individual coaches, student-athletes and representatives of the athletic interests, who had violated NCAA rules and regulations.

When the NCAA expanded its investigative staff and began to penalize guilty coaches, student-athletes and athletic representatives, it was inevitable that some of those individuals would employ attorneys and inaugurate a legal confrontation against the NCAA enforcement machinery.

I should like to quote for you the prophetic words of Louis Meyers of the University of Arizona, who was a member of the Council and presented the Council's year-end report to the Convention in January 1973 at the time that the revised enforcement procedures and the enlargement of the investigative staff were being considered.

Lou said, "With the planned increased emphasis on the enforcement program and the resultant penalties which obviously will result, the Association undoubtedly will be subject to increased pressures, including legal action or the threat thereof from parties directly involved. The Council will remain steadfast in its position that such pressure or threat thereof will not deter the NCAA from adopting and applying governing legislation which is educationally sound in its purpose and in the best interest of intercollegiate athletics."

In spite of verbal and legal attacks, the enforcement program over the past 30 years has been and is today dynamic and changing to protect the needs and interests of the Association's membership. New rules are adopted. Violations of old and new rules occur. New and different issues arise. In large meaning of procedural rights are promulgated.

More and complex infraction cases are processed. Therefore, the Committee on Infractions modifies its day to day operating procedures to meet changing conditions. From its inception, the enforcement program has enjoyed and continues to enjoy full support by the

membership. A review of this operation from 1948 to 1978 fails to disclose a single instance in which the membership favored weakening the enforcement program.

Rather, the membership has voted continuously to strengthen every phase of it, including ample financial support and adequate staff to assure that law and order within college athletics may prevail. Member institutions are pledged to cooperate with the Association's enforcement efforts. Without this assistance and that of student-athletes, prospective student-athletes, parents, friends, coaches and administrators, and all others interested in the good of intercollegiate athletics, the enforcement program could not endure.

The NCAA is a voluntary Association, composed of institutions which join together for the common good of the members' schools. No institution is forced to belong to this voluntary Association, but every institution that does belong must uphold the conditions and obligations of its membership.

**Charles Wright** (University of Texas, Austin): Ladies and gentlemen, under the rules of the Association no one may serve on the infractions committee for more than three consecutive three-year terms. I think after hearing Dean Reynolds, you can recognize what a loss it will be to the NCAA, to its colleagues and to the infractions committee and the enforcement of probative intercollegiate athletics when Dean Reynolds leaves the committee at the end of August.

It has been a great pleasure serving with him. The things I have learned serving with him have a great deal to do with the thick wad of material that appears as proposal No. 161.

I am telling you now why you are getting some eight pages of closely printed material, telling you how the enforcement procedure works. In 1973, you adopted a completely new enforcement procedure for the Association under which the infractions committee was to be taken out of the battle and to be made disinterested judges in these cases.

Harry Cross is primarily responsible for the drafting of the new procedure and it seems to me, having worked with it for nearly five years that I have been a member of the infractions committee, that Harry did an excellent job. The enforcement procedure, as it stands in the Manual, has been a very workable and durable guide on how we ought to handle our affairs.

But in the nature of things, all sorts of questions arise that neither Harry nor anyone else could possibly have anticipated in 1973. Repeatedly, procedure problems come up and the committee has had to decide either by way of a ruling in a specific case or by way of adopting a general policy on matters on which the manual is silent. This is hardly unusual. I know from looking about there are a number of you in the room who are lawyers and who are familiar with the rules of Federal procedure.

They are justly, I think, regarded as the best set of procedural rules that have ever been devised. They are a very short document and you print them in a pamphlet of 36 pages. Yet, in my treatise on Federal Practices and Procedures, I have devoted 10 volumes totaling more than 7,000 words to explaining what those simple rules mean under

particular circumstances.

So it is with the enforcement procedures that Harry Cross presented and you approved in 1973; that an investigator goes to a campus, a student-athlete is produced for an interview and the Athletic Director insists he be present during the interview. Is that right or wrong? The Manual doesn't speak, so the committee has had to make a decision on that.

Do you allow attorneys for coaches who are mentioned in allegations to be present? Initially, the committee took the view that this is an institutional hearing, therefore, only those at the institution that the institution was willing to regard as its representatives could be present. But then the committee thought more about it and concluded that given the very serious interests that the coach may have in these matters, it is right that he ought to be protected by allowing his personal attorney to be present on those allegations in which he is involved.

Questions of this kind arise almost every time the committee meets or has a conference call, and we have thought that it was a service to the membership. If we put together the various decisions we have made on details of this kind, we have brought these forward to you as a new Section 12 enforcement procedure that we hope will be adopted this week in the course of your business sessions.

Mainly, we have not, in what is in your book, answered every question that is going to come up in the future. Indeed, since our most recent meeting only four weeks ago in San Diego, we have had a new procedural question raised with us. We are going to have to resolve that the next time we meet.

We will resolve it for a particular case, because what you are asked to approve gives us the authority to change our procedures from time to time as the need arises. If changes are made, if additions are made, the committee will be back to you next year with additions to Section 12. Our hope is that we are giving the membership the fullest note as possible on the actual way in which an infraction case can be handled. I know that it is a traumatic and upsetting experience the day that your president receives an official inquiry from the NCAA.

For most of you, fortunately, this is a once in a lifetime experience. You want to find out as much as you can on how the matter is going to be handled. We think that the new Section 12 will give you more elements, but it remains true as it always has been, that the staff and investigators are eager to help. They are not your adversaries. They are there trying to enforce the rules that your institution has voted for.

They are receptive to calls on how can we handle this and what can we do about that. The most important point about an enforcement procedure is not that it be written in a book adopted by an NCAA Convention. The ultimate question is are they good procedures? Are they fair in treating individuals who are alleged to have violated NCAA legislation?

One of the heart-warming aspects of what Mr. Sherman referred to was the time-consuming and demanding service of the infractions committee, for me, has been to discover how many people there are



outside the legal profession who are interested in and hold themselves forth as experts on due process of law. I teach constitutional law and I am very glad to know that there is that much knowledge and interest about due process of law among those who are not lawyers.

I do not want to trespass on what I think Bill Matthews is going to be saying, but it is my judgment that our procedures are fair, that they do give all those involved due process of law. The Supreme Court said only a year ago that due process is flexible and it calls for those procedural protections that a particular situation requires.

So it is a mistake to think that an NCAA infractions committee hearing is going to be handled the same way that a criminal trial in the courts is going to be handled. Due process demands the most when life and liberty are at stake. When something less than that is at stake, less exacting procedures are required.

The ultimate question always must be are they fair? I know that there are institutions who have gone to court, who have used the word "railroaded" with regard to the enforcement procedures of the NCAA. My impression, though, from talking to many people who have had the unpleasant experience of being before us, say that they go away perhaps not happy with what we have done but at least with the feeling that we have heard them fairly, we have given them an adequate chance to make their case, that the five of us on the committee have, in fact, been impartial and have done our best as a matter of convenience to arrive at an honest decision in the case.

A final word about due process. There are very nice legal questions that interest me as a constitutional lawyer on whether the requirement of due process applies at all to the NCAA proceedings. It was first the question whether or not what the NCAA does is state action within the meaning of the 14th Amendment.

There is next a question whether being allowed to play in a football game is a property right under the protection of the 14th Amendment. But those questions interest me when I am in the classroom teaching constitutional law, and they are of interest to the NCAA lawyers when they are seeking to defend what we have done in the courts.

To me, when I am sitting in Kansas City or San Diego, or wherever we meet, they are wholly irrelevant. I am not concerned with what the U.S. Constitution requires. I would not want to be a part of the enforcement procedures unless I felt that our procedures were fair to all involved; that we were leaning over backwards to be sure we are not convicting individuals in institutions unjustly. I want to do far more than the U.S. Constitution requires, not the bare minimum.

I am certain this is the attitude of my colleagues and I think this is what in practice we have done. I would like in the minute or two remaining to me, to indicate to you the kinds of problems that come to us on the infractions committee. In many of them, of course, the facts are admitted and when that happens, the question is does it violate NCAA legislation or does it not?

Fairly easy cases are violations that truly can be called technical in nature and that no one is greatly concerned about. But the really hard cases, where it is alleged that major violations of standards that I think

everyone in the room believes we ought to have in your intercollegiate athletics have occurred, are necessarily difficult. If I am going to offer a young man \$15,000 to sign up at the University of Texas, I am not going to count the money out to him in the hall of the elevators on the eighth floor level of the Peachtree Plaza.

It is going to be on a one-to-one transaction done somewhere in the dark of night far from observance. So what happens when the young man tells an NCAA investigator, Professor Wright gave me \$15,000 in cash to sign with the University of Texas, and I file an affidavit (people seem to have a great regard for affidavits)? Personally, I don't think it is any better than any other statement.

I file an affidavit and say absolutely it is untrue, I never offered it or gave that student a penny. The institution then investigates. Let us suppose that the young man (who, of course, was a student-athlete in another school) if he has come to Texas and never heard about the case, hears the story and tells the investigator at the University of Texas that Professor Wright did that.

Then the case comes before the infractions committee. What do we do? Assuming that we have no other evidence than this, we have the young man saying it happened, we have a representative of the university's athletic interests saying that it did not happen, and we have no other evidence to tilt the scales one way or the other. We have had cases like that, and in those cases the committee invariably has refused to make any finding.

Now, it may be that Professor Wright is really a crook and that he is getting off unjustly; but the burden, after all, is always on the staff to establish that a violation has occurred. Where it is a one-on-one choice of credibility, and nothing else to point the way toward the truth, we are not going to make the finding against the institution.

Let me give you an actual situation that we had a few years ago. Four different young men, scattered over a very wide area geographically, and insofar as we knew did not know each other, each said that "Coach X promised me a very large sum of cash if I would sign with him." Coach X appeared before us and he denied it. Once again, we had no corroborating evidence one way or the other except this time it was not just one-on-one, it was four-on-one, although the four were each reporting a different transaction.

This began to sound as if there was a pattern. One can imagine one young man inventing a lie about a coach, but would four widely scattered young men do that? In that case, there was a little more and it finally helped point the way for the decision that we made later on. In the first place, one of the young men said that the coach told him that if he would agree to sign with the school the coach would give him \$10,000 today and another \$10,000 the day he signed the letter of intent.

One wonders why any coach in his right mind would make the first cash payment before the letter of intent was signed? Second, if we were to believe the stories that were presented to us, the coach was willing to pay \$35,000 to a journeyman offensive lineman that no institution was interested in. But \$10,000 for the most sought after quarterback in the state, that is something else. That was showing at least a distorted

sense of values. Finally, though the staff investigated very closely, it was unable to find any evidence anywhere of any slush fund, any angle with which the coach could have honored—I think it was something like \$80,000 in promises that he had purportedly made—this commitment.

I don't know where the truth was in that case, but there were enough improbabilities about the evidence that the committee concluded it could not make the finding on the basis of this, so we did not make any finding of improper promises by the coach. Sometimes probability will lead us in another direction.

I remember one case in which the basic facts were quite well established. A young man was driven home from his official visit by an assistant coach. But on the way home they stopped before they left the town in which the institution was located, at the assistant coach's country club.

The assistant coach went in the country club for 10 minutes, and while he was in there an alumnus came out and spoke to the prospective recruit, handed him an envelope and said to put it in his pocket and open it when he got home. The young man got home, opened the envelope and found five new \$100 bills. The young man, being the kind of young man we hoped to attract to our programs, immediately called his high school coach and said, "Coach, I can't take this. What should I do with this?"

The high school coach came up and picked up the envelope of bills and the next day confronted the athletic director at the institution. All that was admitted. No doubt about those facts. There was no doubt the alumnus had violated the rules and the institution was responsible for his violation. The question was did the assistant coach have any complicity in this?

Was this something that had happened by pre-arrangement or something that happened entirely without his knowledge? We had no direct evidence at all to prove complicity. On the other hand, it did seem odd that the assistant coach, if he is going to have to miss a Saturday golf game because he is taking this recruit home, would not call the country club and tell Mr. Jones that he would not be able to play with him; but instead wait 45 minutes while the recruit packs his belongings, arrive at the club 45 minutes late to go in and tell his friends, 45 minutes after the time, that he would not be able to play with them.

That seemed odd, but I would hardly convict anyone on that alone. But what seemed odd also was the coach. If he didn't have anything to do with this and nobody knew that he was going to bring the recruit by the country club, how did it happen that this alumnus happened to come out and give him this envelope with the five, new \$100 bills?

He said, "Well, I had publicized the recruit, and pictures were in the paper. I think the alumnus probably simply recognized him and thought it will increase the chances of us getting him and he did all this on his own." So we asked this alumnus, you are a man of great means, a man that carries wads of new \$100 bills about with you?

He said no, actually he wasn't. He makes a very modest income and I would be surprised if he had \$500 any time in his wallet, but said it is pretty easy around the country club—you can always borrow money in

the locker room. Well, I understand that. I belong to a country club. I think I probably could borrow \$20 from Darrell Royal if the need arose.

The ability to borrow \$500 to get it in five new \$100 bills and to do all this in a 10-minute span seemed to me unlikely. But the final question was, what was the envelope like that was given to the recruit? What did it say by way of return address? Well, the answer was it was a plain envelope, no return address on it. Where did your alumnus get that on the spur of the moment for his transaction? If you went to the country club's information desk, if you were at the Country Club of Austin, you would find one with their address on it.

Well, on the basis of all that, we found that it was highly unlikely that this was a spontaneous occurrence as it was represented to be and we found that the assistant coach had pre-arranged the transaction. Again, I can't say we were right, but at least it seemed to us the evidence indicated very strongly in that direction, enough so that the burden of proof satisfied it.

Now, one final case, and then I will yield to Dean Matthews. We had a case in which a highly sought after football player reported an assistant coach of a member institution had made a variety of improper payments to him. Every time the coach came by he would give him \$5 or \$10, buy him clothes and various things of that kind.

The coach, not only in his written statement but also in his appearance before the committee, flatly denied that and said under no circumstances did he ever give any improper benefits to this athlete. Well, one of the benefits that the athlete had told us was involved was that the coach took him to such and such a clothing store in his town and bought me two pairs of slacks and several shirts. He described the garments, gave the sizes and all that.

The young man even remembered the description of the salesman who had handled the transaction. He said the coach was there and he paid for them. Coach X said absolutely not. He said, "I have never been in that store with the young man." He said, "I have never bought him any clothing." The member of our investigative staff went to the store and from the description they were able to identify the salesman and they asked him, "Do you remember ever selling some slacks and some shirts to a very well-known athlete in your town?"

The salesman said, "Oh, yes, yes, I remember that. That has been six or eight months ago." He said that he came in and bought his shirts and slacks and a man was with him and proceeded to describe the man. The description fit precisely coach X. But then there was more. The salesman said, "I think maybe our bookkeeper could help you out on this."

So they went back. The bookkeeper went through the ledgers and found the original sales ticket. Here were the garments, the descriptions, the sizes—exactly what the young man had said—and attached to it was an imprint of a credit card. The name on the credit card was the assistant coach's very good friend who, according to the assistant coach's testimony, had given him one of his credit cards and said that he could use it any time he wished.

Well, on the basis of that, it seemed to me proven beyond a reasonable doubt that on that transaction the coach was lying and the young man was telling the truth. If that were so on that incident, I was then prepared to resolve the credibility in favor of the young man and against the coach on the other things that the young man had told us about.

That is an illustration of the kinds of things that come before us on the infractions committee. I think we do bend over to be fair. It is, again as Mr. Sherman has said, time consuming, demanding work; but if you believe as I do in the importance of athletics and the importance of people living up to the rules that govern athletics, I think it is time very well spent.

**W. L. Matthews** (University of Kentucky): Ladies and gentlemen, as has been said more than once already, it has been agreed within the infractions committee that I should try to say something about the fact that the committee conducts its hearings as an administrative hearing rather than a judicial hearing.

It is clear to me that there may be some interest in this assembled group in these hearings as such, because I think all would agree that they are crucial in any infractions case and, therefore, important in the whole enforcement program. Having listened to Charlie Wright, however, I must say that it is not at all clear to me that you would have any overwhelming interest in the difference between an administrative hearing and a judicial hearing.

I think what you really have exhibited interest in are examples of the incredible facts that do come before this committee. But in deference to my colleague, partly because I am the newest if not the youngest member of the committee, I do want to direct your attention to at least three effects of this so-called difference between an administrative hearing and a judicial hearing.

I think these three effects, at least these three, lie at the heart of what this committee views its role to be in this step of the enforcement program. In its most simplistic form, the difference between the administrative hearing and a judicial hearing is just a way of classifying the hearing body as to its fundamental function.

I have noted with considerable interest how the national sports press has picked up on this dimension in some of its comments about the more controversial of our recent infractions cases. The typical comment is that the NCAA is not enforcing the criminal laws of the state or federal government, but is policing the self-imposed regulations of a voluntary membership organization.

This kind of comment, obviously, is designed to keep the fundamental nature of the NCAA violations in focus, and for that reason alone we think it is important that the committee does not mislead anybody about the fact that it is not a judicial body but is an authorized group representing all who hold membership in the NCAA.

Now, in somewhat more of a sophisticated form, administrative hearings may differ from judicial hearings in an important procedural dimension. This dimension probably has full meaning only to lawyers, unfortunately, and I do not propose at this point to bog myself down or

to bog you down in a detailed enumeration of all of the technical rules of procedure characteristic of a court hearing and contrasted with those of an administrative agency.

I am not even sure I could state them all precisely. In many instances, it is my view that the procedural differences between the two kinds of tribunals are more illusionary than real. But I think there are at least two generalities that have some significance and importance here.

First, the rules of an administrative hearing are much less formal than the rules of a court hearing. The infractions committee continuously attempts to conduct its business in the least formal mode. We think that a full, free discussion of all of the alleged violations and what may have caused them is essential to a proper determination of whether they occurred or not, and what the penalty, if any, ought to be.

A second procedural generality is, in my view, that in judicial hearings a court follows the so-called historical rules of evidence. The rules of evidence at best are a set of rather rigid criteria for including or admitting evidence in the consideration of a case. In an administrative hearing, these rigid rules are not followed as strictly.

Before this committee, for instance, there is a need that the evidence be relevant or germane, but we do not include the evidence on the grounds that it might or might not be admitted in court or not presented in a particular way. We consider all kinds of records and documents, for instance, in a real effort to corroborate facts that are brought before the committee in some other form.

This ability to admit and consider evidence without the rigid rules of evidence serves to include the evidence, is very time consuming, I may say. Charlie Wright has properly alluded to that. He has alluded to the fact that since our procedures do allow us to consider all the facts that have been developed not only in the investigation by the investigating staff, but have been developed by the institution itself in its own investigation, this non-exclusionary posture that we take about evidence is very helpful to the committee.

But the trade-off is not just, in my view, the time it takes. It is the fact that it requires us to sift and sort and to make these determinations of credibility, not only credibility between people but credibility may be governed by the form and nature of the evidence. Finally, and in my view most important of all, a judicial hearing is inherently an adversary process.

However, an adversary hearing is not necessarily an adversary process unless those who participate in it can't resist turning it into an adversary process. Again, stating the difference between a judicial hearing and an administrative hearing, in terms of which is more adversary or not, may be more theoretical than is necessary, but it has in my view a very practical effect on the way these hearings happen, in fact.

However good the adversary process may be in a court, for getting a judicial determination of guilt or innocence, sometimes the more aggressive or adroit advocate is the adversary. In the usual administrative hearing, the adversary determination gives way to a somewhat different process, where the enforcing agency, the professional staff and

those who are subject to the rules and regulations have their own methods and responsibilities to determine what has occurred and whether what has occurred is a violation and how best mutually to correct the problem.

Such a hearing, what we call an administrative hearing, is a real invitation and way to allow the cooperative principle which undergirds, in my view, nearly everything that the NCAA does. It allows that cooperative principle to really function. This principle of cooperation, which I take it is a principle of responsibility as well as a responsibility of process, can be of great advantage to the institution who happens to find itself before the infractions committee.

It is the principle that allows the institution to discover its own problems and to reveal them. It is the principle that allows the committee to take that institutional posture into account in finding violations and in designing a penalty. It allows the investigative staff and the institution to work together to finally bring out the facts and the false allegations, or even those allegations that are insubstantial in an evidentiary sense. Most of all, perhaps, and this has been the encouraging thing to me in the time that I have served on the committee, this cooperative principle when properly followed by both or all parties in interest results in an ultimate respect and understanding between all the parties who are at interest in the hearing.

I am persuaded that that mutual willingness to find the facts demonstrating violations or innocence, facts that can stand the light of day, is the thing that will cause the enforcement program over time to be of real value to the membership of the NCAA. So I say to you that the hearings of the committee under the administrative tribunal model rather than the judicial model are intentionally designed to foster that willingness.

**Arthur Reynolds:** We are now ready for discussion. Might I reiterate what Ed Sherman said at the beginning, that if you have a question, please go to one of the mikes. There are several around the room. Please identify yourself and your affiliation for the recorder.

May I also call to your attention that Harry Cross and Jack Sawyer are down there still available to answer questions. Bill Hunt and David Berst of the investigative staff are sitting over here at the front table as well.

**Ronald Dyer** (University of Denver): I have a question regarding the first report. I was wondering if there was any explanation for the differences in the average amount of money allotted to the Division I athletes and the Division III athletes? Just doing some rough mathematics, the Division I athlete receives approximately \$109 per student-athlete while in Division III they receive \$73 per student-athlete.

The total dollars spent on all three divisions on all the athletes is approximately \$257, and yet the average amount spent on Division III athletes is \$195. I was wondering why there is a difference between the amount of money spent per student-athlete?

**Mr. Steitz:** The data you have is based upon the 1976-77 actuals. It accounts for the different sites where tournaments were conducted, where in some cases it is more expensive to send athletes, etc. even other

championships which might have had a close focus of attention to different athletes.

**Mr. Dyer:** I understand there would be differences in transportation costs, but per diem would seem to me to be standard for all athletes.

**Mr. Steitz:** I just want to confer with our controller here. Generally speaking, the per diem is \$20 for most championships. In some cases it is \$25, and in the case of basketball, Division I, it is \$30. This would be set as an ongoing type thing, basically, by the Executive Committee. There is a difference in per diem in certain championships. There is a difference also on televised events. The per diem is \$25, and on nontelevised events it is \$20 a day. That is an additional reason for the differences.

**Cecil Coleman** (University of Illinois): This is on procedure. I think that you indicated at the site of a championship a coach would be given a form to fill out. Would there be any value in having that form brought back to the institution to make sure it is done accurately?

**Mr. Steitz:** Cecil, that is the institution's option, to be sure. If the institution chooses to do it that way, that is fine. The reason for this is to try to expedite so you get your check back a little quicker.

**Secretary Treasurer Sherman:** The members of the panel for the next topic are John Toner, athletic director at the University of Connecticut, Division I Council Member; John Eiler, East Stroudsburg State College, representing Division II on the Council; and Edward Malan, athletic director at Pomona-Pitzer Colleges. He is a member of the Division III Steering Committee. Our plan here is to have John Toner make his preliminary remarks, and then open up the meeting for questions.

**John Toner** (University of Connecticut): The purpose of this portion of the round table is, as Ed said, to answer questions about the membership criteria in each of the divisions. I have been asked to field questions relating to Division I criteria. I may have to ask for help from the Division I Steering Committee, Cecil Coleman, and also those members of the steering committee and our Council who are asked to introduce respective legislation when we go into the voting session tomorrow and Friday.

All this is supposed to be restricted to questions specific to criteria in Division I restructuring and developing of a criteria of the part and parcel of this Convention's plan. In order to relate it to and, hopefully, to just field questions regarding the criteria today, I think it might be appropriate for me just to review some of the reasons the Council felt it was necessary to restructure the two divisions in Division I football and make four divisions in the sport of football, and still retaining three divisions in the other programs, with the possibility of adding special criteria to the sport of basketball in Division I.

At the round table this morning in Division I, I read to the members present from a September 30, 1977 letter from the NCAA president and secretary, received by all presidents, faculty representatives and athletic directors at that time concerning restructuring. From it, there is a paragraph, No. 1, which reads, "The original three-division restructuring plan of the NCAA adopted in August 1973 was based on the premise



that divisions should be available for institutions of like programs, but those institutions in Division I with major programs in a number of sports have had difficulty in achieving a division which meets their needs. At the same time, in at least two previous Conventions, 1976 and 1977, there have been attempts at restructuring and also developing of new criteria."

I think it would be appropriate to read from the record some excerpts that have occurred in each of those sessions and in hearings before the classification committees since then. One advocate urged, as part of an appeal, the development of objective criteria and the opportunity to offer amendments to them in an annual Convention; that we ought to have criteria rather than subjective material to be judged by a committee.

Going on, that person said that the Convention and the Council ought to ask themselves just what specifically are the criteria to be in Divisions I, II and III. He suggested a survey of the membership to see what the reasonable criteria are, with the next Convention to agree on these criteria.

Another advocate said, "Some of the discomfort comes from the fact that the criteria are not spelled out. All I ask you to do is to change the criteria in Division I and give me a reasonable time to meet them. If I can't meet them, then move me." Another one said, "We are anxious to see classification problems resolved. First, we would suggest that the committee should develop definitive criteria. Once these specific criteria are developed, they should be immediately communicated to the membership. This will give the members a chance to evaluate the programs in accordance with criteria."

One last and final quote from another advocate, and this is from the 1976 Convention: "Why do we have to proceed with reorganization without knowing what the criteria are? We should be able to see the definitive criteria and discuss them in this meeting before we are reclassified or before there is even a study of the advisability of reclassification."

So as we go into this portion of it, and questions are asked, it is the hope of the panel that members of the division other than the specific question relative to criteria, members of other divisions, will feel free to ask Division I or Division II or Division III questions.

**John Eiler** (East Stroudsburg State College): Up until this point, as you can see in your Manual, there were no criteria for Division II. This bothered members of the steering committee and also members of Division II. At the request of the membership, the Division II Steering Committee conducted a survey to find out whether or not Division II schools felt there was a need for criteria.

Two things came out. One was they felt very strongly that there should be some criteria and, number two, there should be sports sponsorship involved in this criteria. So with that in mind, the steering committee sat down and tried to pull some things together and came up with Proposal No. 39.

Also, along with the sports requirement, they felt that the sporting legislation should be made so that the sports are being sponsored at a

minimum level, as far as scheduling and participation is concerned. They also felt that if these things appear in the early part of the proposal and along with Proposal No. 16 on Financial Aid, which appears in the consent package, that we should be off and running insofar as criteria for Division II is concerned. So at your leisure, you can glance at Proposal No. 39 and get the idea of what the steering committee thought the Division II membership would like to have.

**Edward Malan** (Pomona-Pitzer Colleges): Division III until this date has had a single criterion for membership. That is an institution in Division III may not award financial aid to any student-athlete except upon a showing of financial need by the recipient. As we come closer to the magic date, August 1, 1979, members of Division III have shown some interest in perhaps broadening criteria for membership in Division III.

As a result of a survey which the steering committee put out this fall, the data indicated that the membership strongly supported some kind of scheduling requirements in both the sports of football and basketball. Therefore, proposal No. 41 in your program has been proposed by the steering committee to meet that need.

In football, Division III members must schedule more than 50 per cent of their games against other members of Division III; and in basketball members must schedule more than 75 per cent of the games against members of Division III. The thrust here was to try to seek a little greater homogeneity to help us to be sure those that were going to postseason competition were doing it on the basis of competition against other Division III members and not upon the competition outside of the Division.

**Kenneth Germann** (Southern Conference): As a point of information for our colleagues in Divisions II and III, we had our Division I round table this morning and I made a statement that I would like to make now for the benefit of Divisions II and III.

In this morning's opening session, reference was made to resolution No. 38, which would ask for a moratorium on a move for reorganization for a four-year period. The supporters and the proposers of that legislation intended there be no tabling effect. We felt football was at its zenith. We felt that football has never been better.

The statistics show the attendance, television ratings and television finances are at the top. We felt at this time that football was good. We felt that a moratorium should be called on reorganization in order to let current NCAA legislation work further or to change legislation that may be a problem. Therefore, so as to emphasize it, we are not trying to table reorganization and that a full and thorough discussion of the merits of reorganization be afforded the entire body.

We intend to withdraw resolution No. 38 and it will not be a part of the legislation.

**Ronald Byers** (University of Idaho): I would like to say that those who might be interested or involved, we intend to withdraw proposal No. 75 that would establish maximum award limitations for Division I-AA.

[The session adjourned at 4:30 p.m.]



## FINAL BUSINESS SESSION

Thursday Morning, January 12, 1978

The business session of the 72nd NCAA Convention was called to order in the Peachtree Ballroom at 9 a.m. by NCAA President J. Neils Thompson.

### 5. ACCEPTANCE OF REPORTS

[Motions were made, seconded and approved to accept the reports of the sports and general committees, treasurer, Executive Committee and Council.]

### 6. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

**President Thompson:** I should now like to move to the consent package and the order of the agenda that was adopted by the Convention. There are eight items in the constitutional consent package. We have not received any objections to any of these. I should like to entertain a motion in this regard, and I will recognize John Eiler.

#### Consent Package—Constitution

**John Eiler** (East Stroudsburg State College): Mr. President, at this time I would like to present proposals Nos. 1 through 8 offered as a consent package, and would recommend approval by the membership.

[The motion was seconded.]

**President Thompson:** It has been moved and seconded that we approve the consent package on the constitution. Is there any discussion? If not, I will ask for a show of your voting paddles.

[Proposals Nos. 1-8 (pages A-1-5) were approved.]

#### Consent Package—Bylaws

**President Thompson:** I should like to move to the consent package for the bylaws, calling to your attention a withdrawal of item No. 13. I recognize Hubert Heitman.

**Hubert Heitman** (University of California, Davis): I would like to move adoption of the bylaws consent package, minus proposals 13 and 20.

[The motion was seconded, and proposals Nos. 9-12 (pages A-6-8), No. 14 (pages A-8-9) and Nos. 17-19 (pages A-9-10) were approved.]

**Mr. Heitman:** I would like to request permission to withdraw proposal No. 13 on behalf of the Council.

**President Thompson:** The withdrawal procedure is that the originator can ask that it be withdrawn, but if anyone in the Convention objects to the withdrawal they may do so and it must be considered by the Convention, because it is before you. Is there any objection to the withdrawal of No. 13?

[Proposal No. 13 (page A-8) was withdrawn.]

**Mr. Heitman:** In behalf of the Council, I should like to move we adopt proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to move adoption of proposal No. 20-1, the amendment to the amendment, which specifies that the resolution must be within a limited time reference.

[The motion was seconded, and proposal No. 20-1 (page A-11) was approved. Proposal No. 20 (pages A-10-11) was then approved as amended.]

### Amateurism—Broken-Time Payments

**Ernest Casale** (Temple University): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of proposal No. 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

Briefly, this is to permit a student-athlete to receive compensation commensurate with the going rate in that locality in order to prepare for or participate in Olympic Games, so long as the payment is authorized by the USOC and by the employer or the USOC.

It covers a period of intensive training. Incidentally, last year the greatest period covered was eight weeks. As far as that is concerned, I think it is a very good proposal and I urge adoption of it.

[Proposal No. 21 (pages A-11-12) was approved.]

### Professional Draft

**Charles Neinas** (Big Eight Conference): At the request of Clyde Walker, athletic director at the University of Kansas, I will speak to proposal No. 22 and move for consideration by this Convention.

[The motion was seconded.]

The problem confronting college basketball today is the so-called hardship clause of the National Basketball Association. For a number of years, the NBA restrictions prohibited its members from signing college athletes who had eligibility.

A U.S. District Court ruling stated, however, that such a restriction constituted a collusive refusal to deal, which violated the Antitrust Act. Thus, the NBA instituted the hardship clause which allowed a college athlete to submit his name to the NBA for inclusion in the professional basketball draft. Under a new system adopted less than two years ago, which is the result of a settlement between the NBA and the NBA Players' Association, the hardship requirement has been replaced by a broader rule.

Currently, any player whose college or high school class has graduated may become eligible for the NBA draft if 45 days prior to such draft the individual renounces in writing his college eligibility. Technically, he must first declare himself a professional before submitting his name for the NBA draft. The NCAA rules allow the student to place his name on the draft list and retain his eligibility if he withdraws his name 24 hours before the draft.

In essence, a student can declare himself a professional for 44 days, negotiate and still have the opportunity to retain his college eligibility.

Such practice has proven to be disruptive to the student, his coach and his teammates. Proposal No. 22 does not prohibit a young man from becoming a professional in the sport of basketball, if that is his desire.

What it does is require such student to make his final decision before renouncing his college eligibility. We believe this proposal is appropriate and consistent with the NCAA rules, and is in the best interest of all parties concerned. We encourage your support.

**Stephen Horn** (California State University, Long Beach): As the Convention might remember, this issue did come before it last year, and at that time it was defeated after a discussion on the floor. I think the worry that some of us have is that this jeopardizes the student-athlete in the sense that it puts him in an unbelievable position in terms of the actual contract offer.

While most of us are very strongly against professional intrusions that have been made, I think we have to say that if the student does not sign, then that student should still remain an amateur.

Otherwise, it looks like we are putting unbelievable pressure on the student from one end. Once we do it, and that student knows that he has no way to come back to amateur status, he is at the mercy of sometimes unscrupulous agents and others. I wonder what the answer is to that question. I certainly worry about it from the standpoint of the student-athlete.

**Mr. Neinas:** I would sanction the fact that the NBA rule has changed and now the athlete, in effect, must renounce his college eligibility. If he does renounce his college eligibility under the current rules, he is a professional for 44 days and certainly has the opportunity to become involved with an agent.

That is a violation of the NCAA constitution. We are suggesting that this young man should have to make that decision before he renounces his college eligibility. The decision is still his.

[Proposal No. 22 (pages A-12-13) was approved.]

#### **Employment—Tennis**

**Laurence Nobles** (Northwestern University): I move adoption of proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit college tennis players to teach or coach in the situation specified, consistent with U.S. Tennis Association regulations. Such employment can be an important source of financial support for a tennis player seeking to pay their way through college.

**Louis Meyers** (University of Arizona): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly in opposition to this proposal. A few years ago, I served on a special NCAA Committee to study our amateurism rules, and to make recommendations to have them conform generally to all sports. In other words, the idea was that our amateur rules are broad and this covered all sports, applied equally to all sports.

This particular proposal makes exception for student-athletes in a particular sport, tennis. It provides for them benefits which are not available to student-athletes in other sports. For that reason, I would strongly urge you to vote against proposal No. 23.

[Proposal No. 23 (page A-13) was defeated 269-177, a two-thirds majority being required for approval.]

#### **Athletic Awards**

**William Flynn** (Boston College): I wish to withdraw No. 24, and we will reword it and submit it at a later date.

[Proposal No. 24 (pages A-13-14) was withdrawn.]

#### **Athletic Awards**

**Joel Eaves** (University of Georgia): I move proposal No. 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

The basic reason for urging approval is the increasing cost of awards, such as rings and watches. We can no longer get the same quality product for \$100.

[Proposal No. 25 (page A-14) was approved.]

#### **Travel Uniforms**

**Paul Dietzel** (Indiana University): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of proposal No. 26.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chairman, I really feel that the image of our travel team is extremely important. I would like to point out that this legislation makes travel uniforms permissible, but not mandatory. I would also like to mention that as many coaches have found, we have a tremendous number of our students who travel and other young people who are around hotels and motels where our teams are, and we have very little or no control over them, but we do have control over our squad.

The problem is to identify the squad, and if we have travel coats on, I think this becomes a very big thing. Now, I realize the point about economy. But I would like to point out that most of the coats have been donated by alumni folks and so forth. Right now we have several dozen coats and nothing to do with them.

It has also been mentioned that all youngsters have their own clothes anyhow and they don't need travel coats and so forth. I would like to point out a case two years ago when one of our basketball players was injured in a tournament, and I had to go to his closet to get his clothes out because he was in the hospital. I was rather startled to find out that he really didn't have very many clothes.

At this point the rule is that a bowl team can provide travel jackets, and really the only teams that have travel jackets at this point are teams that are going to bowls, and they really could buy a travel jacket each year. I think the image that it creates really makes a strong case for college athletics. I say that as someone who has traveled with teams for many years. I really urge that we adopt this proposal.

[Proposal No. 26 (pages A-14-15) was defeated.]

#### **Division I Membership Criteria**

**Richard Pritchard** (Arkansas State University): Mr. Chairman, my motion is on the order of business dealing with No. 27. My concern goes to the traditional procedures of the Convention as they are set out in

the program, namely, that related proposals on our agenda are related topically.

So one would assume that proposals Nos. 27 through 30 bear some relationship and certainly within 27, the subdivision is related. It is also our traditional procedure that in each grouping of related items the Association's established procedure will be followed. That is, that we consider the proposal first which contemplates the greatest modification of the present circumstances followed by the other proposals related of decreasing modifications.

It seems to me that the concern of the delegates has moved to issues that go beyond the criteria that are listed in No. 27-A. There has been talk of fragmentation of conferences and locked out schedules, the lack of self-determination in Division I, the collapse of constraints on spending, depending on which side you happen to support.

**President Thompson:** Mr. Pritchard, I hate to interrupt you, but if you are making a motion to change the agenda, you will need to make it because it is not debatable, and I do not wish you to go further if that is your desire.

**Mr. Pritchard:** My motion is in the interest of all the delegates understanding the issues involved in No. 27. I move that we consider No. 27-B before we consider No. 27-A, which deals with specific criteria on the reorganization.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

**John Toner** (University of Connecticut): Mr. President, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move proposal No. 27-B, which amends Article 8, Section 1-(a) of the bylaws. This is a common bylaw requiring separate votes by each of the three divisions.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, this proposal divides Division I into two subdivisions in the sport of football, Division I-A and Division I-AA. It further specifies that the membership of these subdivisions shall vote separately on legislation which pertains only to the sport of football. In other words, in the divided bylaws, Division I-A football and Division I-AA could each adopt its own differing legislation.

If I might comment further, this proposal, of course, is about restructuring and criteria proposals in Division I this year. The entire concept has been considered in numerous forums across the nation during the past nine months. It is obvious that there are already clearly distinct two tiers in Division I football. That is true no matter what measuring device is employed.

This proposal recognizes the existence of those two tiers by permitting each to have its own subdivision within Division I, and by permitting each subdivision to establish its own rules and regulations in the sport of football.

**Robert Murphy** (San Jose State University): Mr. Chairman, I think I am also speaking, at least to some degree, for 64 other institutions in our particular situation, and at least four football-playing conferences. I ask the indulgence of my colleagues in Division I who probably have been bored with what I have had to say about the matter, but I think it

is important for Division II and Division III people, because I think these issues have a trickling-down effect that are going to be important to them institutionally.

I think they will be important to the entire structure core of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Many, many times in the past we have voted on issues that did not directly concern us, but together with my president and my faculty representative we talked about what was fair and what was right, what was morally just, and we cast our ballot on that basis.

I would like to say that our institution and our conference has traditionally and historically supported the NCAA. We are in constant contact with people in Washington, sometimes on a daily basis, on the IRS legislation, Title IX legislation, the Moss Committee investigation on athletics, and we are very supportive of the things that you are doing and we admire the things that you are doing.

Most of my life has been spent in the so-called bigger universities. I have been a part of the Rose Bowl and a part of the Heisman trophies and some of the best friends I have in this world are in this room. Many of them are on the other side of the aisle on this issue. I don't intend to say anything or do anything to alienate those friendships but this is a matter of extreme importance. It is, indeed, a matter of surviving for our institution, its athletic program, and, indeed, our conference.

I am going to run through very briefly the arguments that have been made for restructuring. I am going to make some comments on them. The statement has been made over and over again, and there are quotes around it, "A greater need for national legislative forum than those institutions with less intense programs."

We think our program is intense. We played three teams in the top 20 and two of them were bowl winners, and we have averaged a 7-4 record the last four years. We have competed for and earned four positions on television in the last three years. I think this business of the legislative forum smacks of a certain kind of elitism that has never been a part of the NCAA.

If we are going to see a renewal of the "Robin Hood" proposals that have been presented in the past—the redistribution of resources, the attempt to add to more successful, etc.—this will do it. Those have been emotional items. I can understand the feelings that have been built up against them, but if you will check the record you will find that virtually all of them have been defeated. We hear about broadly based programs and the relationship of those programs to a big playing arena and how many people watch your football games.

The facts, gentlemen, are different than that. Those of you in Division II and Division III who sponsor broadly based programs don't have large playing facilities for football. I would suggest you look at the Ivy League, which sponsors the most broadly based programs of all, and they are well removed from the top 79.

We hear praise for specific criteria that have divided the present Division I. I submit that the criteria were drawn up to fit the restructuring plan rather than to determine it.

In the cocktail conversation of the last several evenings, we are really talking about the top 30 or the top 40. Twenty institutions in this country have received more than 50 per cent of the television revenue over the last six years. The big schools have that.

Obviously, the line is not going to be drawn beyond the first 30 or 40, because the votes wouldn't be there. For the sake of mathematics, 79 of 144 equals 55 per cent. We are in a rigged position from the start. We are outnumbered 79 to 65.

At San Jose State, we have a modest stadium which seats 18,000 people, but we built ours back in the 1930s. We have just raised \$3 million in our community to expand that stadium to 30,000. We feel that our commitment to football is represented by that investment in that stadium, and I suggest that you look at other institutions that play in public facilities and have never raised money to build or make capital investment in a football stadium.

We talk about improving the game and enhancing the interest in the publicity, the exposure of college football. We talk about the competitive balance. We talk about institutions with like desires on financial aid limitations. I would like to say that the game has never been better. In the last year, we have seen college football attendance rise to heights that it never before had reached.

Television revenues are greater than ever, and television ratings are better than ever. General fan interest is better than ever. The statement has been made that the present Division I will not deal "with academic problems, raising the academic standards of athletics." I do not think the size of the stadium and how many people watch television is related to academic pursuits or intellectual pursuits of your university. I say there are universities all over the country where it is believed that the size of their stadium is in an inverse ratio to their intellectual pursuits.

I think we need more facts to substantiate that plan. We talk about the high quality of football, that we must maintain the high quality of football. Has the quality ever been higher? Has the attendance ever been higher? The point spreads and the odds are not what they used to be. I say college football has never been healthier.

Then there is the statement that has been made over and over again this week in Atlanta by some of the proponents of the issue that we are really happy the restructuring issue of a year ago did not pass.

I submit that the restructuring issue of a year ago was better than the one we have now. It was an 80-point formula that provided at least some upward mobility for schools such as our own and many more like us. I say if you are happy this year because last year's proposal did not pass, then I would suggest that perhaps you will be happier next year with a plan that is not so unfair to 65 institutions and five football-playing conferences.

The arguments against restructuring include the fact that we feel we are locked into a Division I-AA status by the fact that we simply cannot meet the scheduled criteria without upsetting our conference, without trying to play football from the Labor Day weekend to a week or two before Christmas and scrambling all over the country to find Division

I-A people to play.

We don't have any mobility. You give us three years to comply and like every other institution in this room, our schedules extend out 10, 12, 15 years with our traditional opponents. We talk about determining your own destiny, and at the very same time you are taking that destiny away from us. You are putting us in a second-class citizen status because of our inability to meet the scheduled requirement.

Gentlemen, we are not expanding on it, we are not overstating, we are not exaggerating. The plan will break up conferences. The only chance that our institution would have, in spite of a playing record, to maintain Division I-A status would be to bolt the Pacific Coast Athletic Association and that is, indeed, what we will seriously have to consider if this passes. I submit there are other conferences like the Missouri Valley, Mid-American and Southland Conferences that will have to consider the same thing.

I would suggest also that some of our schools have much more in common with the lower level of the top 79 than those schools have with the top level of the top 79. Behind a lot of this, we see "schools with like desires on financial aid limitations." Are there schools in this room that do not like the 30 and the 95.

If so, why don't they stand up and say so. Do they not like the leveling off that we have seen in our competition in the past several years? Do they not like the competitive balance that has been built in college football? If that is behind this issue, I wish those schools would stand up and say that and put it honestly on the floor.

In our opinion, and I think I share the opinion of many top 79 schools, people like Bud Wilkinson and Bo Schembechler have acknowledged that the 30 and 95 limits have brought about a better competitive balance in college than we have seen in many, many years. The game has never been better. We have said that. I think if I have done anything, I have overstated that. The question there is what do the proposed top 79 schools not have now that they would gain by a restructuring plan?

They have the fast buck of the television revenue, they have the bowl games, they have the all-Americans, they have the Heisman trophies. I just voted for the traveling jackets, Paul. I am sorry about that. They have virtually everything.

Yesterday, someone said we had the "shake the tree" philosophy. If you will recall, he was talking about a status quo. Let's live with what we have and build on what we have, and I think that we are guilty of the shake the tree syndrome. Each year we get together and we shake the tree and see what falls out. I would submit that that tree, gentlemen, is Divisions I, II and III, and that tree has never borne more fruit.

That fruit has never been of higher quality. That fruit has never been sent to a more receptive market. I pay tribute to Gerald Zornow, because I think he gave us something to live by. All we want to do, gentlemen, is to do what each of us does every day—compete. These things started out as games, and I think sometimes we forget our challenge educationally.

We are supposed to teach our people to compete. The history of this

country and the tradition is that you should compete for the highest objective. That is all we want to do, what is fair. All we want is upward mobility. If I can read one conclusion to you, it is simply this. Miami University does not possess the economic resources of Indiana University, but the Redskins defeated the Hoosiers; and Indiana beat bowl-bound Minnesota, 16-0. Is it reasonable to say, gentlemen, of Divisions I, II and III, that Miami cannot compete with the Big Ten institutions because its stadium is not big enough or not enough people watch its games? I submit the record states otherwise.

**William Davis** (University of New Mexico): By virtue of attendance, we are perhaps one of the most marginal institutions on the list of the alleged elite, prestigious universities in Division I-A. I received most of my recognition at the honors luncheon when they showed Gifford Nielsen throwing all those touchdown passes. We were the team on defense. (Laughter)

Personally, I would like to say that I have not always been with the Division I institutions. Prior to 1975, I was with one of the "brown paddle schools," Idaho State University. In 1973, when the present divisional concept was adopted, and for the same reasons I do now, I supported further delineation within four identified divisions in the NCAA, namely, so that institutions of similar programs, similar financial resources and similar objectives might utilize common legislative forums for determining the details of national legislation.

The arguments presented that there should be no distinctions between divisions or criteria for establishing divisions are no more valid today than in 1956 when the University and College Divisions were formed, or 1973 when we went to the present format.

Also, I take issue with the argument that the creation of the divisions makes second-class citizens of anyone. The Ivy League, which has been cited already, for example, for several years by self-determination has imposed its own limitations on scheduling, spring practice, financial aid and so forth, with no loss of prestige in the academic world.

They simply set their own level of goals and commitments. The question is how much of a voice should they and others have in determining the goals of the other institutions? Neither did I interpret the desire of certain prestigious athletic institutions to support reorganization as an attempt to dilute or circumvent their equally strong commitment to high academic standards.

For the most part, these same institutions are among the most prestigious in our country in academic as well as athletic. Many of us appreciate their leadership in both.

The criteria in I-A and I-AA may not be pertinent, neither are they set in concrete. I anticipate that further interpretations will be addressed to this matter. As for now, speaking on behalf of the member schools of the Western Athletic Conference, we strongly support the proposed legislation in Division I-A and I-AA with the proposed criteria.

**Victor Bubas** (Sun Belt Conference): We are a young conference in Division I. We do not play football. Collectively, we have given a lot of thought to this proposal. So I would like to ask this question. Are we

headed for a monopoly in intercollegiate athletics? It sounds impossible, doesn't it?

If you think it can't happen, maybe you better look at the potential long-range implications of the NCAA restructuring proposal to be voted on right here. If the restructuring proposal should pass, the institutions and conferences that had no financial problems will be in the majority position when future legislation is proposed.

Those who do have financial problems will be in the minority and will be subjected to potential increases when the types of things like the number of scholarships, coaches and other inflationary proposals. In addition, the ripple effect of future Division I votes might force other divisions to make changes that are not desirable. Should this legislation pass, the "have nots" could be more at the mercy of the "haves" than ever before.

The problem could reach two sports, football and basketball, and more; and additional criteria might be added to make it more difficult to compete. This proposal comes just two short years after an impassioned plea of a special NCAA special Convention to help combat inflation, and yet another Convention to restructure the NCAA. Inflation has not gone away and the pending proposal for restructuring brings forth additional inflationary possibilities.

In addition, the total number of sports required in the proposal for restructuring does not address the problem of sports for women. Until more definitive guidelines come from the federal government sources about the requirement for an equal or less number of female sports, the restructuring proposal is premature.

Finally, how can an institution plan for the future? What, then, is the answer? For protection against the potential monopoly for a reasonable time to control inflation, for an opportunity to have more equal opportunities for women, the safest option open to many institutions and conferences is to vote against the proposed restructuring proposal.

The purpose of this document is to acquaint you with what might happen in the next few years. As the president, chancellor, faculty representative, athletic director or coach, have you given this issue the proper attention? The restructuring proposal offers many an unpredictable future and gives them less control of their destiny.

To the major institutions and conferences, I say this—even the pros have sense enough to attempt to equalize opportunities. To Division I basketball institutions, Division II institutions and Division III institutions, a warning—you could be next. I hope enough of us are wise enough and courageous enough to say right now, one, examine the facts; two, weigh your chances; three, vote your conscience. It may be too late tomorrow.

**Mr. Toner:** Mr. President, although introducing the legislation in behalf of the Council, any remarks I made I would rather have them recorded as director of athletics at the University of Connecticut. I was, too, at the luncheon yesterday and thought that the Teddy Roosevelt recipient was very, very worthy before he received the award and certainly more worthy afterwards, but not for the same reason that was previously given.



Instead as he said following the "shaking of the tree," comment he would rather have all the questions, not some of the answers. Now my good friend Bob Murphy spoke, in my opinion, more to No. 27-A than he did to No. 27-B. He spoke about specific classification subjects that No. 27-A clearly addresses.

Now, Nos. 27-A and 27-B ask for three divisions to support their previous conviction that all schools, similar kinds, have a right to get together and develop their own legislation for the purpose of better competition. Much reference has been made to a top 20 here. Well, perhaps there is a reason for the very best of the bowl aspirants and a goal they all want, that they can't see in our present setup.

But there is another reason why the Division II and Division III schools strongly would consider favoring this legislation. There are many of us who have self-determined a program except for football in Division I, and we play competitive in Division I. We are not allowed to legislate in Division I in our football issues. We must legislate in either Division II or III. The "brown paddle schools" have been mentioned here.

Perhaps an explanation of what "brown paddle schools" really are should be made for the Division II and the Division II folks, as well as newcomers to Division I. "Brown paddle schools" represent a group of about 50 institutions who, when the reorganization of the three divisions first took place, were not able to declare their football program in Division I because it wasn't part of the reorganization plan.

They found themselves to be part of Division II for legislative purposes in the sport of football. Now, in my state of Connecticut, we have a state university and we have several other state colleges, all of whom reside in Division II. Our program is contrary to their program in many areas. It is not fair for me to vote on Division II issues in the sport of football and hinder their chances, and together with 49 other "brown paddle schools" we have legislated against Division II football and against the will of that whole division that wants to decide for themselves on the broadest issue, not only football but all sports.

So, this legislation that we have before us, in my opinion, gives all of us at the low end of Division I football a chance to get our program in a competitive situation. Once in it, we can develop a I-AA national champion, which will be much better, much fairer and very economical for I-AA, and might save considerable programs in Division II football.

**Kenneth Germann** (Southern Conference): I would just like to call to the attention of Division II and Division III people who were not at our round table yesterday morning the remarks made by President Shriver of Miami University. I will read the same message that Mr. Shriver read yesterday morning.

The NCAA Council appointed the Classification Committee and after listening to institutional appeals in a reclassification effort of June 1976, concluded through its chairman, Louis A. Meyers, that after listening to the statements of many university presidents, faculty representatives, directors of athletics and conference commissioners, all of whom expressed the vitality of football in the athletic programs to the entire university community and the adverse psychological and

educational images reclassification would inflict, the committee determined reclassification of Division I institutions was not in the best interest of intercollegiate athletics.

It is our belief that conclusion still is valid today.

**Richard Lyman** (Stanford University): With all due respect to my colleague from the University of New Mexico who spoke of being on the margin, and the lower margin at that, of Division I-A to Division I-AA proposed, I submit the real question is on which side of that dividing line do you fall, not how close are you to it? I think that the issue is a close judgment call.

It is clear that in some sense, and not entirely easy to define, there is a natural dividing line between the institutions that would meet the criteria of I-A and those which would like to but cannot. It does not seem to me justified no matter how "natural" the dividing line may be today to freeze it by a means which is far from natural, that is, artificial, into permanence. We are assured from time to time that the proponents of Division I-A have no intent of taking the lid off, have no intent of attacking in major ways the 30-95 limits and the other limitations that have been placed upon us. But I must confess I find it difficult to see what the driving force behind the movement is unless it is to remove or significantly raise those limits.

We are also told the College Football Association is behind it, that it need not be feared, and simultaneously that if what the majority of the College Football Association wants is not delivered at this Convention they may bolt the NCAA.

Now, these interpretations are inconsistent. They simply cannot both be true statements. I am not going to guess which is true. I am not privy to their minds. What I do know is that American higher education, not just those of us who took the trouble to come to Atlanta, but American higher education where we all work will not stand for the dismantling of the NCAA.

I believe it is time to diminish the paranoia, the divisiveness. If there were visible grounds for fearing that the major football powers would be emasculated and if we were to retain the present organization or wait until we can devise a reorganization that is more genuinely flexible, my institution and I would favor restructuring. I don't see such grounds.

I am opposed to restructuring and so is my university.

**Fred Davison** (University of Georgia): I am president of the University of Georgia and currently president of the Southeastern Conference. I am chairman of the board of directors of the College Football Association. I have in each of these positions had the opportunity over the past years to listen to a great deal of discussion concerning this reorganization.

I have come from that discussion as a strong supporter of this proposal. In essence, it does no more than ask that institutions of similar programs, similar financial resources and similar objectives be able to utilize common legislative forums for determining the details of national legislation.

The spectrum of the College Football Association has been raised.

The discussion in that group has been both careful and thoughtful and has avoided pressing the issue of what would happen following this particular meeting. We had hoped and continued to hope that we would be allowed to reach a point where these common issues among the institutions could be solved in this forum.

I also would like to say that at least as far as my institution is concerned, we recognize that this solution, as presented in this proposed legislation, is not perfect, and if unchanged, it would be the first time in history that such a solution has been found. We recognize that if it causes serious problems with other institutions, then those problems could be looked at and changes made. We are certainly open to that. Finally, I would have to say that my relationship with the institutions that are supporting this proposal leads me to believe that these institutions have been those who in the past certainly have carried their share of the burden in regaining the great public respect and confidence that the general public has both academically in our program and athletically.

I see nothing to fear in their continuing concern as they sit together to look to the future.

**James Litvack** (Ivy League): Having been used by each side in the debate, or rather cited, I guess we should respond. It is true that the Ivy group schools collectively have set our own goals. They differ from the goals and from the limits set by many other institutions.

We do not seek and never have sought to impose those goals on others. The essence of reorganization, it seems to me, is to state that because one is different one must be shunted off to a separate division which is to be viewed as inferior. We suggest the Convention refrain from continuing down this road and we oppose reorganization.

**Marcus Plant** (University of Michigan): The University of Michigan has been fortunate in having a long and warm relationship with the NCAA. We believe the NCAA has been vital to the orderly development of intercollegiate athletics in the United States. We also believe that the issue here is whether the NCAA is going to be able to adjust and accommodate the needs of a segment of its members and, if you will forgive me, an important segment.

Institutions such as the University of Michigan which operate major intercollegiate varsity programs in a number of sports, have greater need for a national legislative forum than a great many other member institutions. Our programs are interconference, interregional and national in scope.

To deal adequately with these issues, we need a legislative forum composed of institutions with comparable varsity programs in scope and nature. Now, the NCAA can deny us that forum, but I think it would be a bad mistake to do so. I am not one of those who entertains the thought that there will be a mass exodus if this legislation is defeated.

As President Lyman indicated, there is no present threat which would be damaging to our programs. There are some provisions which we would like to see changed and which we believe have been unwise in the past. I think, for example, of the freshman eligibility rule.

There are a number of such measures. They do not include taking off the financial limits in athletics, or starting an inflationary spiral. What I think will happen if this legislation is defeated is that an organization such as the College Football Association is very likely to develop and become much more effective. I do not like to see that type of organization on the periphery of the NCAA. If, indeed, we do have damaging legislation, such an organization is a vehicle which could lead to the division of the NCAA and could change it into a sort of federation in which we were loosely tied together with various groups, essentially not having a common purpose.

It seems to me that this would not be in the interest of intercollegiate athletics in this country.

We have a number of measures in mind that Division I-A would seriously consider, including raising of academic standards.

In conclusion, I should like to say we need some sort of a protective organization. Robin Hood was sent to Sherwood Forest two years ago, but he may be back again. There may be other measures and proposals that may be back. What we need is an organization, a division which will afford us a relatively secure measure of perfection. I strongly urge the delegates to vote in favor of restructuring.

**Robert Leestamper** (Southeast Missouri State University): I represent a Division II institution. On this issue I have to address myself to some of the other issues that have been raised about conscience, about the level that athletics are at this time in America. I want to respond not as an institutional representative but as an American citizen.

I am concerned about what will happen to athletics in Division I if we remove the 30-95 limits and take a different stand about need issues. The last speaker referred to the fact Robin Hood may come back and said he felt some concern about it. Even though there have been some people that have indicated they will not remove the limits, there is no reason why they can't in Division I.

So, we have a tough problem in reference to that. I favor the idea of those institutions that are similar in nature having an opportunity for self-determination. That seems to be a very important principle. My concern would be that in addressing their own interests, that various legislation may take place that would have such an effect, not just on Divisions II and III, but on intercollegiate athletics in general.

I think we are now much better off than we were three, four and five years ago on various issues. I would be deeply concerned about reclassification on this basis. Another proposal may come where we wouldn't have those concerns. I don't think the present one has the safeguards to allow me to be able to vote in favor.

**Marc Griesbach** (Marquette University): I had not intended to speak to this issue since my school does not at present have a football team. But it is the rhetoric that I hear and I have heard for the last two years that prompts me to at least caution my fellow delegates in Division I not to be misled by the notion that somehow we are obstructionists in the sense that we are cast as the villains; that we are impeding the progress of football; that we are somehow suppressing the needs of the powerful universities; that we are in some way not

cooperating with the NCAA, or that we are perhaps not providing the opportunities for a better program in athletics.

I suggest that this is not the case at all. What we are doing is more to the advantage of football and athletics as a whole than some effort to concentrate the power in a few places. I think there is a serious danger of something like a monopoly. I think there is a likelihood that this effort in football will trickle down to basketball, and perhaps to some of the other sports.

Unless we are alert to this kind of a strategy now, we are going to have more and more of this sort of thing as the years progress. I suggest very seriously that all the arguments, the valid kind of arguments that have been proposed against this reorganization be seriously considered by all members of Division I.

**Ross Smith** (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): The emphasis of our division, Division III, has been mentioned by several speakers. I simply want to say we have had a chance to determine our regulations and we are very interested in Division I having the same opportunity.

We have discussed thoroughly both issues and how we feel they relate to our membership. We are letting each institution make their own decision. We hope that it remains that way without any question.

**Lt. Gen. Richard Irby** (Virginia Military Institute): I feel it is appropriate as superintendent of the smallest Division I institution in the United States, to the best of my knowledge, to comment. We have competed in a broad base program since the 1800s. We have always competed in Division I or its equivalency in football.

In modern times, we have been ranked as high as number 13 nationally in football. The past two years we have been the Southern Conference champions in basketball. We have gone to the regionals and the quarterfinals in the NCAA Basketball Championship. We have been the overall conference champions once in the past four years and co-champions this year.

We support 11 recognized NCAA sports, and one sport not recognized by the NCAA. I say that we have a broadly based program. We have a program which is competitive. If Division I is divided into Division I-A and Division I-AA, it will do irreparable damage to our program.

**Edward Betz** (University of the Pacific): As you know, I have had an opportunity to observe the development of two reclassification programs. This has been a most interesting experience. Almost always when a legislative proposal is put before a house, the proponents of the proposal bring forth their arguments, present their points of view, establish the reasons, determine the need for the change.

On this occasion, all of the specifics, all of the arguments against, all of the discussion of need have come from the opponents of the proposal. I have listened very carefully and I believe the only argument that I have heard from the proponents of reclassification could be phrased that we want it. It seems to me that this is a very flimsy basis on which to vote.

There is a second observation. We have all heard the analysis on how the voting might go from three or four in the majority for it, to three or

four in the majority against it. Any proposal which does not bring a large number of advantages to any group of schools, but certainly brings a large group of disadvantages to another group of schools should not be decided by a swing of three or four votes.

I present these arguments knowing that my university will meet the scheduling requirements. We have the third-largest private stadium in the state of California, and all we have to do is to nudge a few more people in the gates and we will meet the standards. I think we should not vote in favor of this proposal for the damage that it will do to our conference and to many other institutions.

**Paul Dietzel** (Indiana University): I recall the address yesterday by the president of Miami University, Mr. Shriver. Now, Nashville State is not Ohio nor is Miami University Ohio State. I hope that Miami University never tries to be Ohio State. Apples are not oranges. It is hard for us to figure out what the problems of the others really are.

Having been a member and come to these NCAA Conventions for more than 30 years and having been on all levels in the NCAA, and having great respect for the NCAA and what it stands for, I really do not think it is bad to be a large institution with a large stadium and a huge budget, and I repeat, a huge budget.

But we do have unique problems in sitting around forums and round tables where people have the same problems and it really helps us in our development. Not letting these schools who have like problems have their own forum, places many schools of this size in a very critical position.

**Rev. Edmund Joyce** (University of Notre Dame): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question on procedure. Apparently, this particular issue, No. 27-B, is to be voted upon by all divisions. Is that correct?

**President Thompson**: Separately, yes, sir.

**Father Joyce**: What happens if it passes in one, fails in the second, and passes in the third?

**President Thompson**: This is a common bylaw; thus, if it doesn't pass in all three divisions, then, of course, it fails.

**Father Joyce**: The second question is one of clarification. If one division votes against this, do we revert to No. 27-A, and if that passes, that has the effect of reorganizing the NCAA as it presently stands?

**President Thompson**: It would have a significant effect, yes, sir.

**Father Joyce**: Mr. Chairman, I think the answer to my first question dramatizes part of the problem that we have in the NCAA, in the sense that legislation which seemed like to many to be truly critical, perhaps the most important legislation brought before this body in the last 25 years could be thwarted by one division or a group which has very little at stake in the positive outcome of No. 27-B, the proposal set forth there by the NCAA Council.

I think one of the major reasons behind this drive for a more refined restructuring within the NCAA is this very problem that we face at these Conventions. There is constant parliamentary maneuvering. Much time is spent on the trivia. It is hard to get a reasonable debate going among such a disparate group of schools. I think it is this kind of

frustration that has led to the desire on the part of a number to have the kind of structuring where we can have this kind of responsible debate and speak about issues which concern us very directly.

It seems to me that in the history of this organization, the NCAA has adapted to changing times. There is no one here, I think, that would like to see the demise of an organization such as the NCAA. It does provide an umbrella and a very important function and service to intercollegiate athletics throughout America. But it must have resiliency.

I believe that the principle of trying to establish this within these divisions has been accepted by the vast majority of people in the NCAA. As another speaker pointed out, we went into College and University divisions several decades ago; and then in more recent times, it was seen that something ought to be done largely because of the problem of intercollegiate football.

Here we have schools that really have quite different philosophies concerning their football programs, and certainly quite different programs in themselves; and I am told when this was first considered that there was strong sentiment on the part of the Classification Committee for four football-playing divisions. That didn't go through at the time.

I assumed that one reason it didn't was possible it was felt that, well, let's not move that hastily. Let's try it, wait and see if that works. I submit to you that on the view of many, and these would be the so-called major college powers, this division of three has not really worked. It has been a cause of growing tension, as acerbated by the financial crunch in which we all find ourselves, I believe.

But, nevertheless, a serious growing tension that pertains to those schools that have for one reason or another found themselves with a major program in football and others who really do not aspire, as far as many of us can tell, to that status. Listening to a lot of the conversation and the debate so far, one has to wonder really whether a number of these schools who feel they are going to be relegated to a lesser position into I-AA actually aspire to being in the top category.

I think if they do, I would be the first to fight for their ability to move upward, to have that mobility. I think it would be a grave mistake on the part of any of us to try to establish a closed corporation that prohibited that kind of mobility. I think all of us ought to be opposed to that. However, we do find ourselves today with a volatile situation. It has become an emotional issue and perhaps it is difficult to separate the emotion from rationale when you get into these things.

As I again listen, it seems that some take umbrage because they feel they are being relegated to a second-class division and their pride is hurt. Maybe this is understandable. We have been told that you have no problems, you big schools with major programs. We are not going to perhaps introduce any more Robin Hood proposals.

We think things are fine right now and let's not shake the tree, let's have peace and harmony and go along with the way we have been. Yet I think it is obvious, as I mentioned before, that there is this tension. What bothers me, I think the most, is the fact that I really do detect a great divergence and philosophy in regard to intercollegiate football

among the institutions in the present Division I.

I think that this is reflected in some of the things that were said, for instance, in the letter put out by the presidents of the Mid-American Conference. They mentioned they thought the proposed criteria for new divisions returned to commercialism and entertainment standards.

Then again at the end of their recent document, they stated that they felt this reorganization would further erode "the precarious justification of large scale athletics in a higher education setting." Here I think is a reflection of that divergency of opinion. I think that most of the people that I know who do have major programs will take great umbrage at statements of this sort.

We realize that football has been subject to abuses and there have been scandals from time to time, and we all regret it and resent it when it happens. Yet should we make a change in a program that causes large crowds to come into the stadium? Do they mean that we are simply in the entertainment business and ought to do something about it, ought to reduce our programs, perhaps, so that there will be "less commercialism" or less attention on the revenue producing aspects of football?

I think it is a fortuitous thing that we do attract large crowds into our stadiums. I think it has been a healthy thing for intercollegiate athletics in this country. As we all know, in many schools this has helped to support the very sophisticated programs of athletics and certainly benefitted many, many boys. So I think this particular bias is one that we resent. Yet when you have two groups with such divergent philosophies in the same room together constantly jockeying for position or for the success of their own point of view, you are going to have constant friction.

I think that all that is being requested from this particular proposal is that you put the apples together and the oranges together. Let us fight out these problems that we have in our own group. Both groups are relatively the same size. If one wanted to move downwards (and I hate to use the words "downward and upward," I think of it rather in terms of parallel to move in one philosophy or the other), let's allow it to do so.

I feel certain that we will come up with criteria that will enable that to be done. One problem now is the fact, as another speaker mentioned, is that this is not a perfect plan. The criteria are not perfect.

But I come back to the point that this is an extremely important issue before all of us. I think the critical part of it is how do we further divide. I again submit to you that I wonder whether Division III would really be involved in this. One speaker said that each school will vote its own conscience and that is fine. Other speakers have indicated that they are afraid there might be a monopoly evolving in the event that this further reorganization goes through.

I don't really understand quite what they mean by that. I think all of us agree that if any really awful things came out of the new division this entire body with its intelligence would have a chance of vetoing it. As I understand it, the two-thirds vote veto still would be in effect. I know again from my own dealings with all of these men, that there certainly is no attempt here simply to ask for a blank check from the NCAA Convention.



This group of presumably Division I-A schools would be the first to desire, I think, rational restrictions. One of the objectives is to have an equal fight in competition, to try to keep the football strong but keep it strong at a very high level of performance.

Again, to be perfectly frank, I think the chief worry is that a large group within the present Division I now does not have this same objective by any means. I think they would much prefer to have the quality, but they would like to have it on a common denominator in which they could feel more comfortable. This is not the case today.

I think you will find considerable resistance on the part of the so-called 79 or 80 schools to have this happen. Why continue this tension? I think that we are here at the crossroads in the NCAA. We certainly hope that this will be resolved amicably. As far as Mr. Betz' point being that no one has presented all the arguments, I would refer him to many of the printed materials, including the statement that came out under the signature of the 79 schools, in which I think the argument is very well-reasoned and laid out in understandable form.

So perhaps it didn't have to be repeated here today. Gentlemen, I think probably I have talked enough for the moment. I do urge you to take this matter very seriously and to understand the concerns of those who feel that this Division should come about and vote in favor of it. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Smith:** Now, briefly, to respond to the first question that Father Joyce raised, we are extremely sensitive to the fact that Division III will vote on 27-B and 27-C particularly since we have been able to legislate our destinies.

Our membership has agreed, and I sensed this at our round table yesterday, that we will vote as institutions and, hopefully, in fact, the indication is no external pressure. I want to assure the Convention there is no desire on our part except to give Division I a chance to settle its own affairs.

**William Callahan** (James Madison University): I would like to make a very brief remark and also ask the chair to, please, clarify something. Ours is a state institution and not a Catholic school, and I know that Father Joyce is very popular and well-known.

I am sometimes called Father Callahan, although I am not Catholic. I appreciate the fact that he was the chief Robin Hood slayer a couple years back. But a couple of things that Father Joyce said, I do think need at least clarifying, if not rebutting. One, it seems to me, is that Father Joyce was using a very veiled semi-threat; that if Division II and Division III happened not to approve No. 27-B, that Division I football schools then could come and approve No. 27-A, which would then relegate the schools that would have been I-AA to Division II.

I would like to ask the chair, therefore, if it is in fact true, according to the program, that we could by a two-thirds vote of the entire Association rescind the action of the football playing schools in Division I or No. 27-A?

**President Thompson:** That would be correct.

**Mr. Murphy:** This response is directed to President Davison of the

University of Georgia. President Davison, I would suggest that the record shows that only 10 schools in this country have received more television revenue than the University of Georgia since 1970. I did not check the bowl games but it appears to be the Bulldogs do play 12 games each year.

Mr. Plant at the University of Michigan who teaches his law students to compete for the highest level and the greatest rewards, talked about a broader base. He said the College Football Association did not really provide for the Big Ten or the University of Michigan, but they were looking for it because the base was not broad enough.

I would suggest that 144 Division I schools is something of a broader base than 79. I would suggest also that the lower 65 of Division I and perhaps, indeed, the 40 below the top 38 or 39 have provided over the years a pendulum of sanity for this organization. I don't have to talk much about Michigan's bowl appearances or the fact only eight schools in the country are higher on the list than the University of Michigan in television revenue.

The question comes up again and again and again, gentlemen, and it has not been answered. It was not answered by President Davison. It was not even addressed by President Davison. In fact, I think he countered it by going the other direction. It was not addressed by Marcus Plant, not addressed by Paul Dietzel nor, indeed, it was not addressed by Father Joyce.

The question again is, gentlemen, what do you not have now that you would gain by restructuring? Would someone please rise and tell me that? You talk of the bowl revenue, talk of the TV receipts, talk of the TV ratings, talk of general fan interest, talk of national championships, talk on and on and on. Now, tell us, please, what do you not have now that you will gain by this plan?

Father Joyce, I would suggest this to you, the University of New Mexico is represented arguing on the same point of principle as yours; and I would suggest, if you will, that there is a much more divergence between Notre Dame and the University of New Mexico than there is between New Mexico and San Jose State University. Think about that for just a moment.

Certainly, there is tension here today. There is tension when your very life is on the line. Our athletic program and our conference, 64 colleague institutions and four football-playing conferences, have our very lives on the line. A year ago this time, there was the same desperation of those who would bolt the NCAA, those who would defer to the college football situation. If the University of Michigan and the Big Ten Conference have reservations about college football, I would submit the only differences between the proposals of the College Football Association in September 1976 and those of this Convention are very simple, 70 per cent of the games vs. 60 per cent.

The same 30,000 seat stadium; 17,000 paid attendance versus 20,000. The NCAA Council has bought the CFA plan. It is simply that simple. Now, the desperation of a year ago did not materialize. Nobody bolted the NCAA. As a matter of fact, college football had its greatest year. We do not argue on emotional bases.



We argue on the basis of logic. We argue on the basis of basic morality, and we are not too proud to ask for your sympathy.

**Edwin Cady** (Duke University): I have been gone awhile and while I was gone I have noticed some changes in coming back to the NCAA. One of them is that we are much more biblical than we used to be. I can remember when there was an NCAA Convention and there was not tension.

One of the problems is what we have heard very often this morning: the bigger universities, many of which are also among the most powerful intellectually, creatively, in research work and in the stand in their graduate schools (who are furnishing to the smaller colleges your faculties), who, in many ways, are American higher education at its highest level, are also the schools that have major football, basketball and athletic programs.

Father Joyce said he thought perhaps this was fortuitous. I suspect this is not fortuitous. I suspect that is something very deeply built in the American culture that keeps getting reflected here at the NCAA, that makes these things happen. But that is another set of stories. I have grown weary of the notion that somehow that if you belong to what is now, and this is all new to me, a Division III school or a Division II school, that you are more moral, or that you are more interested in matters intellectually.

Now, people have asked what are the real issues? Gentlemen, among the real issues are precisely the things I have been talking about. Things have changed a lot in 10 years or a little more perhaps. We have lost the 1.6 rule. We have spent a long hard time inventing, trying to write in plain English, the first recruiting rules for the NCAA.

We did a pretty good job. We had some of the best of them voted down or even rescinded on the floor overwhelmingly with a vast majority of the votes coming from the smaller schools who had, in fact, no interest. Practically and individually, the problems which we were trying to meet were the rules.

When you ask what are you really talking about, I think what we are really talking about is what President Lyman very sensibly was getting at, when he said there is a natural difference. Now, he says it is a close call and I agree with him. Things are not the same for me, speaking from Duke, as they were from a larger and much more athletically prosperous public institution. At a private institution, where our costs are very, very high, indeed, we are walking the tight rope.

I dare say as President Lyman, and for exactly the same reasons, what will happen, how will it come out if we should entrust our fortunes to Division I? Will they promptly run the numbers way back up, run the costs way back up and run us out of business? I don't know. But I don't believe so. Mostly that is because I don't believe that most of the people who are proposed to be in such a division are the kind of people who would do that, who wished to do it or who would permit the people, if there are any such who wish to do it, to get away with it.

I don't believe there is going to be any walkout either. I don't think this is a problem that is going to go away. It isn't true that we can say, "Well, things were never better. We have no problems." We have

terrible problems. One of the big difficulties for people in the proposed Division I schools is that with the NCAA, as it has functioned in the past 10 or 15 years, we have not had freedom to address ourselves effectively to the solution of the problem because people who are wiser and moral and intellectually somehow have a higher order of integrity than we, keep insisting on getting us all tangled up in what, so far as I can tell, perfectly irrational situations. I do think that at least we should supply some kind of an answer to the question, what in the world do you want? A clean road, maybe.

**Father Joyce:** I only do this because Mr. Murphy requested it. However, he did pose this question which he says is critical to the debate, namely, what would we (and I suppose "we" would mean the 79 or 80 schools that would be in Division I-A), get through this reorganization that we do not now have?

Well, the direct answer to that question, from my viewpoint, is simply this, that we would get from this an alignment of schools with similar philosophies, similar programs and, best of all, we would then get a forum within the NCAA grouping to discuss these problems and to come up with reasonable decisions that are not based on emotion or on a majority vote of a large group of people, swayed by all sorts of things.

I think this is the critical thing we would get. I believe it would give us an opportunity, those with major football programs, to do something that we have not been able to previously, and that is to develop a genuine respectability of major football programs in this country.

I denote a very strong conviction on the part of the leaders in this group of schools that look toward improved academic standards, restrictions on playing time, on games, on all sorts of things that could be good for not only the image of college football but for the reality of college football. It may seem strange to say this, but I think a lot of the abuses that have happened within college football came about because of our inability in this large group of so many different divergent types of schools to come to grips with the real problems and to debate them among ourselves, and to provide that kind of platform where these things can be done, and be done responsibly.

It would give us an opportunity, I think, to bring our coaches a little bit more into the discussions so that we do get a general consensus on what is the proper and right thing to do. If we can all agree to that, I think it would be effective in its results. Now, we can leave here with some legislation imposed which may be helpful to those that don't have these sophisticated programs and very damaging to those of us who do. One thing I think the press has never realized is that the major college football schools were very much opposed to the freshman rule.

We were not in favor of the removal of the 1.600 rule on the academic standards. These were all steps backwards that enabled more exploitation of athletics, more shortcomings on the part of the university. These are the kind of things we would like to come to grips with, and then have you watch us very carefully and see whether or not we don't act responsibly for intercollegiate football.

**Mr. Griesbach:** Mr. Murphy could do this much better than I, and I am sure he doesn't want to speak a third time. I don't want to repeat,

but on the basis of my conviction what we said tends to have a little more weight. What he said earlier, that we have been subjected here to generalities, there has been discussion about terrible problems.

The very request of Mr. Murphy has not been answered, either by the spokesman from Duke or Father Joyce from Notre Dame. We are told there is some mysterious need, some mysterious justice that cannot be addressed because Division I is 144 rather than 79. I can't believe that an intelligent body like this could be taken in by such remarks.

[Proposal No. 27-B (pages A-17-18) was defeated. It was approved by Divisions II and III but defeated by Division I, 115-142, with approval required of all divisions.]

**Wayne Duke** (Big Ten Conference): May I respectfully request a roll call vote among Division I members?

[The motion was seconded.]

**Frank Remington** (University of Wisconsin, Madison): On Page 97 of the NCAA Manual, there is a provision, Bylaw 11-1-(d), that provides very specifically, "Only members of Division I which sponsor inter-collegiate football classified as Division I may submit legislation applicable to Division I football. Such legislation shall be subject to vote only by members classified Division I in football and, if adopted, shall be applicable only to such members."

It seems to me that is a clear indication that, although the vote has to be divisional because it is a common bylaw, within Division I matters affecting only football are to be voted on only by schools in Division I which qualify as schools sponsoring the sport of football. I ask, therefore, for a ruling of the chair.

**President Thompson:** After consultation with the Parliamentarian, and as I look at his recommendation, it is that Bylaw 11-1-(a) calling for a common bylaw applies to three divisions of the Association. All three divisions are voting. It doesn't seem to us to make any exceptions.

**Mr. Remington:** I move the ruling of the chair be overruled by the membership.

**President Thompson:** Let me see if I can state your overriding request, and that is that Bylaw 11-1-(d) is applicable in this instance rather than Bylaw 11-1-(a), and that the vote insofar as the divisions are concerned would be only in football. Have I said that correctly? All right. Let me see if I can state it correctly.

My interpretation is available for discussion to you. It will be a Convention vote, because it is an interpretation of the Convention overriding the chair. From this point, we will then ask at the appropriate time, after discussion, a vote of the Convention. So it means that this must have the attention of all of you. Now, is there any further point in this regard?

**Mr. Remington:** I might say, in speaking to the merits about the ruling of the chair, it means in Division I that both football and other members can vote on proposal No. 27-B that is presently before the house. It is very possible that that vote will be determined by those schools that play only Division I basketball.

Now, on the other hand, when we get to 27-A, the criteria, I take it, it will be the ruling of the chair that since that is not a common bylaw, that only those schools that play in the sport of football can vote on that proposition. It seems to me that it will result in the ridiculous situation that members can vote on those two propositions will differ.

Very likely the outcome will differ. I speak not to the merits but urge the Convention to adopt a sensible procedure that will allow everybody to vote the merits as their conviction calls for, but to do so in the way that is procedurally sensible.

**Stephen Horn** (California State University, Long Beach): Am I correct, then, that the chair has ruled, and I think correctly, that on matters that require the approval of all three divisions to become part of the bylaws, that every member of the Association in every division shall have a vote, but when you get to No. 27-A, since that only pertains to criteria dealing directly with football, not with the effect of reorganization of Division II and III, or even the basketball schools within Division I, that it then will be only the football playing members of Division I participate? Is that the correct ruling?

**President Thompson:** I think I interpret that as being correct.

**Sterling Adams** (Tennessee State University): I want a point of clarification on the interpretation of the chair in regard to the ruling. Bylaw 11-1-(a) indicates that Bylaws 7, 8, 10 and 11 should be voted on by the divisions in the Association. I believe it was inferred from the interpretation that the Bylaw 11-1-(d) overrides that with regards to Section 1-(a) when it comes to divisions, is that right, so that football-only matters would be voted on separately by members of Division I participating in football?

**President Thompson:** Only those participating in football in Division I. That was not my ruling. That is the point that is made by the overriding motion.

**James Drinnon** (University of Tennessee, Chattanooga): I would like to refer to Article 11 of the bylaws, Section 1-(a), for membership, which Section 1-(a) provides, "In each division of the Association may at any Convention by a majority vote of the members of such division present and voting, adopt or amend any bylaw not inconsistent with the provisions of the constitution of the section."

"Bylaws 7, 8, 10 and 11 apply to the three divisions of the Association, thus any amendment of them must be adopted by all three divisions."

I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that this body felt those bylaws were so important that all members, regardless of the sports they participated in, should be able to vote on those issues. The issue before the house is not a football issue, but a question of restructuring Division I in all the NCAA meets.

**Joe Gallagher** (Syracuse University): It has been suggested by some that a percentage of the members of the NCAA would be disenfranchised, and in the case of an affirmative action on the appeal of the chair, that those institutions carrying white paddles would not be able to vote in any category.

Mr. Chairman, what would your ruling be in the case of an

affirmative action on the panel to the chair? What status would those "white-paddle institutions" have?

**President Thompson:** They will not be permitted to vote on this issue.

**Mr. Remington:** May I suggest they could vote, and they can vote to override the ruling. They are entitled to vote on football issues. If they prevail as part of the two-thirds majority, that is what the bylaws provide. It was urged that the majority vote of the members of such division for every bylaw, and therefore, I take it even on 27-A, that the nonfootball-playing schools by that argument have to be available to vote.

I see, therefore, no applicability for Section (d) if the ruling of the chair is sustained. Again, it does not seem to me that this question goes to the merits. It seems to me that in Division I matters only applying to football to be decided by those schools, and a safeguard for those that don't play football in Division I, and make a motion to reverse that. This demands a two-thirds vote with everybody voting, and that action is reversed. That is what I understand the procedure to call for.

**Richard Nelson** (Northern Illinois University): A point of clarification. The section cited by the gentleman from Wisconsin states only members of Division I who sponsor intercollegiate football may submit legislation. Article 8, Section 1, says, "Each active member institution shall be designated as a member of Division I, Division II or Division III for certain legislative and competitive purposes."

My question is, the compilation of No. 27-B was not submitted by an institution but by the Executive Council. Is it in order?

**President Thompson:** Yes, sir, it is in order. Are you ready to vote now? Any further discussion? If you vote in favor of this motion to override, you vote to—my good Parliamentarian sets me straight. Your vote "yes" is to sustain the chair; your vote "no" is not to sustain the chair. That is the interpretation of the correct motion for you to consider. I want you to understand that.

**Mr. Drinnon:** Will the chair please state its ruling again?

**President Thompson:** I will try. You will note that Article 11 on Page 97, Section 1-(a) refers to the fact that any amendments to Bylaws 7, 8, 10 and 11 would be voted on by all divisions separately. The point I made, as I understand it, and not expressed as well, I am sure, is that that Bylaw 11-1-(d), states "Only members of Division I which sponsor intercollegiate football classified as Division I may submit legislation applicable to Division I football. Such legislation shall be subject to vote only by members classified Division I in football and, if adopted, shall be applicable only to such members."

The point made in this regard is that that is overriding insofar as Article 11, Section 1-(a). I ruled in favor of Article 11, Section 1-(a). The overriding motion is in regard to Article 11, Section 1-(d), and this in effect becomes an interpretation by the Convention and thus requires a vote of the Convention as a whole and is a majority vote.

Are you ready for the question? I will repeat. If you vote "yes," that sustains the chair. If you vote "no," the overriding position prevails. All

in favor of sustaining the chair, please hold up your paddles; all opposed to that position hold up your paddles.

[The motion carried.]

**Mr. Duke:** I respectfully request a roll-call vote insofar as Division I members on No. 27-B.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

Mr. President, may I respectfully request a roll-call vote on all three divisions.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

**Cecil Coleman** (University of Illinois): Mr. Chairman, before I move any part of proposal No. 27-A, I think it was the intention of the Council that 27-A-a-1-2-3-4, O.I. 900 and 5 each be moved separately which, as I understand it, would take care of Amendments 1, 2 and 3 on the yellow sheet.

**President Thompson:** In other words, they will be divided. Let me say this, you can move them all and then request they be divided. In other words, that saves repeating each one. You have moved them all and request they be divided.

**Mr. Coleman:** I move No. 27-A at this time, and that it be divided.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, there was some question earlier about what would happen if 27-B failed, which it has, and if 27-A passed. Someone indicated that they would automatically go to Division II, which is not true.

Those institutions that did not comply with the criteria of No. 27-A, if it passes, would have three years to come into compliance with No. 27-A. I move, Mr. Chairman, No. 27-A-1.

[The motion was seconded, and proposals No. 27-A-1 and 27-A-2 (page A-15) were approved.]

**President Thompson:** If you will turn to your yellow sheets, you will find that Amendment No. 27-1 is for the deleting of Section 3 from this amendment. I should point out that by your action on this vote, we are taking that same action and thus without amendment to amendment is unnecessary. So all you have to do is to vote for or against Section 3.

**Donald Shields** (California State University, Fullerton): I wish to make a procedural motion on the matter before us and also to ask for a related ruling of the chairman. I believe that the discussion this morning clearly demonstrates that the issue before us is a very significant, sensitive and emotional one.

Importantly, a member of the Executive Council who has attended the NCAA Conventions for 19 years has referred to this item as well as proposal No. 27-A-4 as the most divisive issues in his memory of the NCAA deliberations. Therefore, with this background and to ensure minimum, either direct or indirect, influence on individual institution decisions, and also considering the fact that our covering procedural document for this Convention points out that in confidential ballots members are more likely to vote their true sentiment, I move that there

be a confidential ballot on this matter, Mr. Chairman.

[The motion was seconded.]

In addition to and for the same reasons, I have emphasized in making this motion that is to ensure minimum, direct or indirect, influence on individual institutions' votes on whether or not to conduct a confidential ballot by No. 27-A-3, and I am asking that the chairman rule this determination be decided by a confidential ballot of the Division I football membership. I make these requests, Mr. Chairman, because I must reiterate that the matter before us represents the most important organizational issue the NCAA has ever voted on.

**President Thompson:** We will first vote on a motion which proposes to take a secret ballot vote, on the first motion, to take a secret ballot vote on Section 3 under No. 27-A.

**Henry Lowe** (University of Missouri, Columbia): Mr. President, I would like to make a substitute motion, that in each instance these be roll call votes for Division I football-playing members.

[The motion was seconded.]

**President Thompson:** A substitute motion has been made that we have a roll-call vote. This is permissible. It has been seconded and this is not debatable either. That takes precedence over the other motion because of the time element.

**Mr. Shields:** A point of information. I have an inquiry. The motion is for a confidential ballot and we now have had what in essence is a substitute motion, is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

**President Thompson:** This is in order.

**Richard Lyman** (Stanford University): A point of information. We are now to have a roll call on whether to have the confidential ballot on the restructuring, is that correct?

**President Thompson:** No. This replaces the overall motion.

**Mr. Lowe:** I wanted a roll-call vote on item No. 27-A-(3). If there is a secret ballot that comes before that substantive issue, I want a roll-call vote on that substantive issue and the procedural issue; and that is my motion. It is a substitute motion that will cover both points, if necessary.

**President Thompson:** I think I am going to interpret that you have to make that in two separate motions.

**Mr. Lowe:** I will move that if that is the interpretation.

**John Stoepler** (University of Toledo): I believe the executive regulations expressly provide that a request for a secret ballot goes to the Convention. I believe you indicated that the vote would be by the football schools only. Will you clarify that, please?

**President Thompson:** Executive Regulation 1-5-(c), voting by roll call or by secret marked ballot shall occur only when voted by the Convention. A request for a roll-call vote or a secret marked ballot must be moved and seconded and approved by a majority of the eligible voters present and voting. Only the football group would be eligible voters on this matter.

**Mr. Stoepler** (University of Toledo): Mr. Chairman, if that is the

ruling of the chair. I appeal that ruling. I think the language of that regulation is quite clear. It refers to the question going to the Convention, not to a part of the Convention. It refers to all those eligible voting members present and voting.

**President Thompson:** I have ruled that this applies in this instance only to the football-playing members of Division I. You are asking for the application to the entire Convention. That is your interpretation. I am going to present this to the Convention.

If you sustain the chair, your vote is "yes." If you vote "no," you are going to override the chair.

[The motion to sustain the chair was approved.]

Our vote now is of the Division I football group to substitute a roll call vote.

[The motion was approved.]

**Mr. Shields:** Mr. Chairman, I call for a count, please.

[The motion was approved, 78-73.]

[The Convention was recessed at noon.]

## FINAL BUSINESS SESSION

Thursday Afternoon, January 12, 1978

The session convened at 1:30 p.m., President J. Neils Thompson presiding.

### 7. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

#### Division I Membership Criteria

**Donald Shields** (California State University, Fullerton): I would like to rise to a point of order regarding the disposition of the vote prior to recess on the grounds that the chair moved so quickly for recess, that in the confusion of exit we could not make a request for a roll call on an issue to be decided by a change of only three votes.

I, therefore, request the privilege of the assembly that a roll call be taken on the issue of whether a roll call should be held, in lieu of a secret ballot on taking a secret ballot. I think the point, sir, is that I don't feel there was adequate time for discussion and for consideration of the issue, particularly when we have only five votes and three of them decide the outcome.

**President Thompson:** I must say I am going to rule your request out of order, simply because there is no way of assuring a recount of that precise number at this point in time. We have recessed, and we cannot go back and reconstruct that vote. From this standpoint, we are moving for a roll-call vote.

**Mr. Shields:** I would like to challenge the ruling of the chair. You recessed and just came back into session. A call for a roll-call vote is perfectly in order. If the assembly does not wish to have a roll call, they can decide it by a vote.

**President Thompson:** Let me point out this will also be ruled out of order, because it is a request for a multiple roll call, and as a third degree it is out of order. I am moving now to the roll-call vote that was called for by the last vote at the recess of the Convention. Did I hear another inquiry?

**Mr. Shields:** I challenge the ruling of the chair. I would like to vote on that.

**President Thompson:** All right. He has challenged the ruling of the chair. The ruling is that he has called for a roll-call vote and I have overruled it as being out of order, because there have been three motions on the floor at one time. For that reason I ask now for your vote to sustain the chair's ruling or to sustain his motion, and the vote is before you.

If you vote "yes," you sustain the chair. If you vote "no," the chair is overruled. This is Division I football only.

[The motion was defeated.]

We will now move to the roll-call vote, and I will ask Ed Sherman, the secretary-treasurer, to call the roll. The vote is whether to have a confidential ballot on Section 3 of proposal No. 27-A.

[The motion was defeated, 64-88.]

**President Thompson:** We are now back to the discussion of Section 3.

**Ernest Casale** (Temple University): I just have a few comments to make. The attendance requirement is bothersome and unfair, and I believe it is a bad compromise of some of the elements of last year's reorganizational plan. I don't believe attendance is necessarily indicative of a broadly based program.

At our institution, we sponsor 14 men's sports and 13 women's sports; we are national in scope in many of our programs and have appeared in several NCAA championships. Our budget is \$2 million. To me, that is a pretty fair commitment. Our philosophy, and I am sure this is true of other schools, is that the program should not be dependent upon the receipts. Instead it should be budgeted like any other department in the university.

I don't believe that a school that has a 20,000 paid attendance has a greater commitment than one that has a 15,000 paid attendance. This leads to a chief concern on my part that the attendance requirement of 17,000 this year will be 20,000 next year and 25,000 the following year. My fears in this regard are confirmed by the fact that in the opinion of some of us on the Council and the Division I Steering Committee, the definition of how paid attendance is established and discount prices handled are different from those approved by the Division I Steering Committee on the Council.

The interpretations and changes can be made in a short time. What is going to happen between now and next year? To me, the number of sports and financial commitment better define the broadly based program. Attendance is a dangerous criterion and I urge that you join me in defeating this proposal.

**Fred Jacoby** (Mid-American Conference): The fundamental policies on page 6 of the Manual state that there should be retained a clear line of demarcation between college athletics and professional sports. I think what we are trying to say is that we should retain our amateur competition on an amateur basis.

Any time you start using attendance as a criterion, you turn to commercialism entertainment. A lot of factors can affect your attendance, such as the size of the community in which your university is located, the geographical location of the university, the size of the student body, the number of resident students that you have, the number of commuter students you have and the location of the professional franchises.

For example, in the Mid-American Conference, six of our 10 institutions are located within 100 miles of an NFL franchise. So in our judgment, attendance is a poor criterion to use.

If you are going to accurately police this, we are going to have to take all people on the NCAA investigative staff and assign them to one



game, and they still will not be able to cover all the entrances to the stadium. In our judgment, this is bad legislation and we urge you to defeat it.

**James Drinnon** (University of Tennessee, Chattanooga): A point of order, please. I would like to call the chair's attention to Constitution 4-3-(b)-(2)-(ii) which was amended January 12, 1977, and dealt with allied members. I might read that to you. "It must be composed of at least six members in a single division, except that those allied members with at least six members which meet all other criteria for voting shall be permitted to vote on all constitutional issues and on those bylaws which apply to all three divisions of the Association as specified in Bylaw 11-1-(a). They shall not vote on those bylaws which may be amended by one or more divisions acting separately."

The chair might not have been aware of that 1977 amendment.

**President Thompson:** I am not too sure I can adequately explain the ruling on (ii) that you referred to, 4-3-(b)-(2)-(ii) which in effect is if you have at least six members you have the opportunity of voting in a single division. If you do not have six members in a single division, you do not have that vote. That applies only in that regard.

So it is not applicable in this instance.

**Mr. Drinnon:** I think the English is clear here, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to challenge that the allied members can only vote on those bylaws which apply to all three divisions.

**President Thompson:** All right. Your challenge is it applies only to the active institutions, is that what you are saying?

**Mr. Drinnon:** What I am saying is that the last sentence of that paragraph provides, "They shall not vote on those bylaws which may be amended by one or more divisions acting separately." Only Division I is acting on this bylaw and accordingly the allied members are not invited to vote.

**President Thompson:** I am advised the key feature is up there, "except that" and that makes for this addition.

[Proposal No. 27-A-3 (page A-15) was defeated, 74-76.]

**Henry Lowe** (University of Missouri, Columbia): I would like to request a recount and roll-call vote on No. 27-A-3. I thought my motion was in order before. You will recall before lunch you asked me to make two motions. One was pertaining to the secret ballot, whether we should have a roll-call vote on that, and, secondly, a roll-call vote on the item.

I made those motions at that time, and I am now again asking that we have a roll-call vote.

[The motion was seconded, and a roll-call vote was approved, 78-71; on the roll-call vote, proposal No. 27-A-3 (page A-15) was approved, 82-73, with one abstention; see Appendix C (pages A-104-105) for a record of the vote.]

**Eddie Crowder** (University of Colorado): Mr. Chairman, I rise to propose No. 28 as an amendment to the amendment.

**President Thompson:** Eddie, that is, in effect, going to be voting on

(4), so, really, No. 28 is redundant. It is a divided vote so, in effect, we are going to be accomplishing that. If you are talking to your point, make your point in regard to (4), however.

**Mr. Crowder:** We find that point No. (4) is really a redundancy expressing again numbers, attendance, and, secondly, we think a criterion based upon the size of the facility is again unneeded. We do not find this of value as part of the criteria.

[Proposal No. 27-A-4 (page A-15) was approved, 83-68.]

**Mickey Holmes** (Missouri Valley Conference): Mr. President, I move adoption of No. 29, an amendment to 27-A-O.I. 900, providing a definition of a paid admission for accounting procedures.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal was presented to the Convention for the development of O.I. 900 contained in the reorganization package. Yet, there are some major differences, we feel. This proposal does include procedures for counting tickets which students, faculty and staff are required to purchase. It provides a definition for a complimentary ticket, and it provides for consistent accounting and filing of reports on attendance. This obviously is a critical aspect of the reorganization package and we think it needs to be outlined more precisely than is presented in O.I. 900 of the original plan.

After all, with this new philosophical approach within the restructuring package, the particular illumination, the almighty dollar is the basis for judging the effectiveness of a football program, we do feel that these more precise accounting procedures are required. To have a status change through existence of precise legislation is one thing, but to have a potential status change facing you as a result of the loose legislation and subsequent interpretation is another. We would urge you to support substitute O.I. 900.

**Cecil Coleman** (University of Illinois): Mr. President, speaking in support of O.I. 900, I wanted to point out to the membership two definitions of the regularly priced ticket and also the discount ticket as arrived at by the Council, and this is the way it would be interpreted if O.I. 900 is passed.

That is, that a regularly established price ticket will be that ticket that is established prior to beginning of the season, and anything less than half that regularly established price ticket will be a discount ticket.

[Proposal No. 27-A-4 (page A-15) was approved.]

**Andy Geiger** (University of Pennsylvania): Proposal No. 27-4 would permit membership in Division I football for those 12 or 15 institutions which sponsor broadly based programs but are unable to meet the stadium size or average attendance criteria for the very reasons Mr. Casale outlined in his previous appearance on the floor.

Commitment to intercollegiate athletics as evidenced by the number of varsity sports included in an institution's athletic program has been a cornerstone of the reorganization plan that we are considering at this Convention. I represent an institution which has 19 sports for men and 15 sports for women.

At Pennsylvania, in the sport of football, we field four intercollegiate teams involving 180 student-athletes, and freshmen are not eligible for varsity football. We do not claim competitive comparison which has been referred to here as the top 79, nor do we intend to impose our style of intercollegiate athletics on others.

However, we seek that legislative division which best understands the broadly based programs and the commitment of the considerable and necessary resources to support those broad base programs. For these reasons, I ask Division I football-playing members to support this amendment to proposal No. 27.

**Richard Lyman** (Stanford University): We have heard a great deal of oratory about the virtues of these broadly based programs. This gives us a glorious opportunity to back that oratory with votes. We still have the scheduling requirement and there is no real need to worry about the vast change in what we voted thus far. I support this amendment.

[Proposal No. 27-4 (page A-17) was approved, 73-70.]

**President Thompson:** Now, let's move to subparagraph 5 of No. 27-A, old subparagraph 5, which under this procedure will become subparagraph 6. So, now, subparagraph 6 is for your consideration. I should call your attention to the amendments to the amendments on the yellow sheets. No. 27-3 called for the deletion of subparagraph 6, but in effect by your voting for or against accomplishes the same thing.

[Proposal No. 27-A-5 (page A-15) was approved.]

**President Thompson:** Because No. 27-B failed, Nos. 27-C and 27-D are moot. We will now move to No. 27-E.

**Wiles Hallock** (Pacific-8 Conference): Mr. President, I move the passage of proposal No. 27-E.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of proposal No. 27-E, which amends Article 9, Section 1-(b) of the bylaws, is to establish criteria for membership in Division I basketball and as importantly criteria for membership in Division I for those institutions which either have no football or have football programs in a division other than Division I.

It further provides that separate voting may be conducted on legislative issues which pertain only to the sport of basketball. There are three amendments to this proposal, Mr. President: proposals Nos. 33, 34 and 35-A.

**Mickey Holmes** (Missouri Valley Conference): We wish to withdraw No. 33.

[Proposal No. 33 (page A-23) was withdrawn.]

**Wayne Wright** (Pepperdine University): We move adoption of No. 34, which is an amendment to No. 27-E.

[The motion was seconded.]

Pepperdine University proposes this amendment to proposal No. 27-E out of concern for the so-called "free school philosophy" of the large number of small universities competing irrespective of their size today in Division I. The philosophy that the quality programs depend on the broad base offerings is discriminatory.

In the last three years our university has been ranked in the bottom of the seven sports. Large universities of 3,000 may be able to financially sponsor 10, 15 or even 20 sports, but the smaller universities should have the right to specialize and limit the number of sports and compete where they are capable. Pepperdine University, and other similar universities, will be forced to add two or three new sports at a tremendous cost to remain eligible to compete at the Division I level in sports other than football and basketball.

[Proposal No. 34 (pages A-23-24) was defeated.]

**Richard Bowers** (University of South Florida): I wish to move proposal No. 35, which amends proposal No. 27-E. This amendment permits the counting of women's sports in the 10-sports criterion.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chairman, it is felt that if we are to meet our institutional responsibilities in what we know to be the spirit of Title IX, it seems reasonable and appropriate that women's sports be counted in this important criterion issue.

[Proposal No. 35-A (page A-24) was defeated.]

**President Thompson:** We now are back to No. 27-E. Is there any further discussion?

**Wiles Hallock** (Pacific-8 Conference): First of all, No. 27-E maintains the 75 per cent scheduling requirement for Division I basketball membership currently on the books; and, secondly, it requires that an institution sponsor eight varsity sports if it has football, and nine if it does not, in order to carry full Division I membership.

An institution that meets this criterion and the 75 per cent scheduling requirement competes in all sports and votes at the Division I level with the exception of football, which may be in any division.

Proposal No. 27-E says that members of Division I basketball shall vote separately on legislative issues which pertain only to basketball. Now, under the provisions of proposal No. 37-A, institutions whose basketball program is in Division I and who do not meet the eight or 10 sport requirement also will have a vote in Division I on issues pertaining to basketball only.

The flexibility which is given to basketball-only institutions, or Division I basketball institutions whose football programs are not in Division I by this proposal, is intended to provide for the first time the opportunity for those institutions who wish their basketball to be in Division I, and the remainder of their sports at a less emphasized level to do just that, and still retain their vote on basketball issues in Division I.

**Frank Rienzo** (Georgetown University): If the item, as it currently stands, is defeated, what would be the disposition of the present Division I basketball schools?

**President Thompson:** As it is, they would not be affected.

**Mr. Rienzo:** I wanted to be sure before I addressed the motion as it now stands. I listened this morning to Father Joyce and his eloquent presentation regarding the needs of the football schools and the things that are very important to the growth of football and its continued

excellence. I would have to say that I agree with him 100 per cent.

I believe that the football schools have had an opportunity to decide the issues involved in football. Whether I personally agree with them, I think is unimportant. Georgetown University does sponsor 21 inter-collegiate sports. It is in Division III football.

Somehow or other, though, I don't understand why now it is necessary to bring in a new sport into the problems of Division I football. Basketball has experienced a growing interest and many schools have had excellent basketball programs without feeling a necessity to correspondently carry out a Division I football program.

Therefore, I believe that the status quo is sufficient; with the present legislation of Division I regarding football, changes were fine, but let's allow Division I basketball remain as it is. I would like to have attention of those football schools which believe they have been deserted by the NCAA in the legislation that was just passed. We would ask you to join with us now so that the same fate that has befallen you will not befall us.

There is a very, very basic, philosophical concept of war—divide and conquer. We are in a competitive arena. Divide and conquer is very simple. Therefore, those of you who are in Division II football that feel your rights of self-determination has been destroyed, we ask you to join with us in the defeat of No. 27-E.

**Mickey Holmes** (Missouri Valley Conference): The points the gentleman from Georgetown made are exceptionally good. I think it is up to the Convention to very seriously consider that adoption of No. 27-E could lead to the same type of debate that we have experienced here so far today relative to restructuring in basketball.

If this is defeated, Division I basketball and all the legislation associated with it remains exactly as it is today.

**John Kaiser** (St. John's University, N.Y.): I would like to point out some observations that I think bear upon this subject. Number one, I think in the discussion and debate it shows clearly that this is primarily a football problem. I see no reason to bring basketball and other sports into this discussion.

The football schools desiring Division I-A status have made it clear their position that they would like to band together and take care of their own destiny. I would appeal to them to think of schools primarily basketball in nature, who would like to do the same.

Mr. Toner, of the University of Connecticut, made a presentation at the round table concerning the 50 "brown paddle schools." He outlined the difficulty of the administration of those in two divisions, and the fact they were not able to vote or put their football programs in the division they were interested in. I would like to point out to the Convention that if this basketball section is passed, another group of institutions will be cast into Division II against their will.

I also believe that the so-called retroactive criterion is unfair and unjust. These people have been in Division I, have competed in Division I, and now are passed out against their will. What choice do they have? Number one, they can aspire to gain the number of sports necessary to

make them eligible for Division I. In a time of economic hardship, there has to be a commitment of more money, staff and so on.

Sports probably would be chosen for economy, not because they want success or because there was interest on campus. Mr. Jarrett of Old Dominion yesterday pointed out another particular circumstance—that he is trying to take care of the HEW and Title IX requirements by circulating questionnaires to find out what sports are of interest on his campus.

Unfortunately, the ones he found out were of interest were not NCAA sports that could be counted. So he is in double jeopardy. There is no doubt that this particular situation would cause internal friction. If a university was not able to get more money from an outside source, they would have to take it from other sports already in existence.

That is not a pretty situation. The NCAA sports definition in this proposal is rather limited. As was pointed out by Mr. Rienzo, all the sports on campus are not under the NCAA championship concept. At St. John's we have, with an addition next year, 19 varsity sports, of which only nine meet the requirements in this proposal. That does not detract from the fact that we have made a contribution and a commitment to intercollegiate athletics.

In conclusion, I would like to support the proposition that we defeat No. 27-E and the succeeding paragraphs F, G, and H; so that those with Division I basketball programs will be covered by the present legislation.

**Marc Griesbach** (Marquette University): I think most people would agree that we have been competitive in Division I basketball in recent years. As the proposal stands, we would be eliminated from Division I basketball. My question is this. What is the reason for this effort of the present criteria for Division I membership?

It seems to me the only basis conceivable would be one which recognizes the present situation as unfair. How, unfair to whom? As far as I can see, it isn't mandatory that a university require or have 10 varsity sports in Division I if it doesn't have football as is our situation, in order to be fair in competing in basketball. So it seems to me very clearly that there is some other motive.

What could the motive possibly be that would find the present criteria unsatisfactory? We talk about a broadly based program. I wonder about the whole concept. Of course, we want to provide opportunities for a large number of our students to compete at length. Marquette, in the last few years, has been working at this, both for men and women and for extracurricular sports.

We have expanded tremendously so far as the opportunities to compete in athletics are concerned, but we still would not qualify for these present criteria. It seems to me that something as important as this ought to be very seriously considered before schools like my own and like many others would be callously eliminated from competition in Division I.

I know very well that some have pointed out that 27-A would allow for us to petition for membership in Division I basketball only and for the right to vote. Now, don't forget there is a difference between assured

acceptance in Division I basketball with the right to vote and being allowed to petition for membership in Division I.

I suggest this is a rather hazardous situation for any university to be in. I suggest that the only way to manage to preserve our present and I think justifiable status, Mr. President, is to vote down this proposition.

**Mr. Hallock:** It seems to me, Mr. President, while the Convention has rejected classification into I and I-A and I-AA by its actions in supporting 27-E and by other action it has endorsed the concept of a broadly based program for Division I membership, I would simply like to point out that if you vote against No. 27-E and maintain the status quo you are rejecting the broadly based sports concept.

If you vote in favor of it, you are continuing with what the Convention has seemed to have preferred up to this point—a Division I with a broadly based sports program.

**Robert Thomas** (Pepperdine University): I would like to address the question of being a broad base. Who can argue with the broadly based program? But I ask this question: for an institution with enrollment in excess of 20,000 that sponsored 20 intercollegiate sports; compared with an institution one-tenth that size which sponsors, say, five intercollegiate sports, which institution is providing the more broadly based program?

I think there are other criteria that can be used to establish broadly based programs which would include the intercollegiate women's activities, the intramural activities, the extramural activities and those sports which should not come under NCAA auspices. I pose this as a question of fairness to the assembly, for those institutions who have made the very objectives and goals, the decision to be excellent, but in so doing they must uniquely choose and limit the number of their programs, be they academic or athletic in nature.

You ought to have a sense of fairness. I request that proposed 27-E be defeated.

**Mr. Kaiser:** Once again, I would like to disagree with what was said by one of the previous speakers. I think the legislation that has been passed to date only is involving football. We are now addressing ourselves to the rest of the package, of the so-called broadly based program. I thought I brought out also in my previous remarks that that is a stereotyped, limited view of a broad base since it limits it to only those sports that come under NCAA championships.

Many schools have made a considerable financial commitment and a commitment to staff, and the student on campus and in other sports, and of varsity status and are not included in this group listing.

**Wayne Duke** (Big Ten Conference): I would like to refute the statement by the gentleman from Georgetown University. You will recall he said the football schools had an opportunity to determine their own destiny. My own assessment of the voting on proposal No. 27-B indicated many "white paddle schools," those conducting basketball programs, who actually determined the outcome of that vote.

**Mr. Rienzo:** In reply to Mr. Duke's remarks, if he was observing the whole hall he would see that a lot of the "white paddle schools" were on each side of the room, divided.

[Proposal No. 17-E (pages A-18-19) was defeated.]

**President Thompson:** There will be a need for some editorial aspects in order to accommodate the prior vote on No. 27-B.

**Harry Troxell** (Colorado State University): As you pointed out, Mr. Thompson, there have to be some editorial changes made in No. 27-F in light of the failure of No. 27-B. The changes would be the deletion in the second line regarding Division I-A football, Division I-AA football and Division I basketball. I move for the approval of No. 27-F.

[The motion was seconded.]

**President Thompson:** Yes, because No. 27-E failed, those would have to be deleted. Let me make one additional comment. As a result, this becomes a Division I football matter and not a Division I-only matter.

**Mr. Troxell:** This proposal establishes a one-year grace period for a Division I institution which has met the criteria for Division I. Subsequently, if it fails to be in compliance with those criteria at the end of any year after meeting them, that member is placed in what would be called provisional membership for one year.

If it then is not in compliance with the criteria at the end of the one-year grace period, it shall be reclassified in a division for which it does meet the existing criteria. If it does not qualify for any other division, it becomes an associate member. It must be emphasized that this does not give an institution four years to meet the new criteria being proposed. It must meet the criteria before it can qualify for the grace period.

After it has met the criteria, it can get one year to try, and at the end of the one year, in which it fails, it would not be in compliance.

[Proposal No. 27-F (page A-19) was approved by Division I football.]

**Kenneth Herrick** (Texas Christian University): I would like to move adoption of proposal No. 27-H as it pertains to Article 9, Section I of the bylaws.

[The motion was seconded.]

With the approval of No. 27-A, the membership indicated it wanted sports sponsorship criteria. All No. 27-H does is simply delineate and define what sports sponsorship is in terms of numbers.

**President Thompson:** Now, No. 35-B is an amendment to No. 27-H, proposed by the University of South Florida.

**Richard Bowers** (University of South Florida): Mr. Chairman, the University of South Florida wishes to withdraw this amendment.

[Proposal No. 35-B (page A-24) was withdrawn.]

**President Thompson:** All right. It has been withdrawn. Now we revert back to No. 27-H. Any further questions?

**Jack Kaiser** (St. John's University, N.Y.): Is this not once again adding further criteria to the status quo in the basketball situation and other sports?

**Mr. Herrick:** Yes. When I read No. 27-H, it simply defines what was passed in No. 27-A with reference to what constitutes a sport and how

many participants you must have to be sponsoring the sport and how many contests you must enter in order to be sponsoring this sport.

**President Thompson:** I think our interpretation up here would be this is applicable to football because that is the only place that we have this sports requirement.

[Proposal No. 27-H (pages A-19-20-21) was approved.]

**Harold Westerman** (University of Maine, Orono): In light of what has transpired regarding No. 27-A, and voting on the prevailing side of 27-B, I should like to ask at this time for reconsideration of No. 27-B.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Jack Davis** (Oregon State University): Many of us, in looking at this reconsideration, would like to consider some of the safeguards offered by the permanent amendment which is an amendment to No. 27-D. I would just like to comment, therefore, if reconsideration is passed I would then ask that Nos. 27-B and 27-D be joined so that we could consider at that same time No. 32.

**President Thompson:** I guess we are reconsidering the motion, and at that point we will deal with your request for a suggestion. Any further discussion on the reconsideration of No. 27-B?

**Marino Casem** (Alcorn State University): It is clear, to at least some of us, that the football-playing members of Division I want two divisions. There are 157 eligible votes in Division I and 115 of those voted in favor of I-A and I-AA. This was defeated 115 to 142. Some of the "white paddle schools" played a large role in this vote; and this vote hurts our institutions and all institutions that want a chance at those 46 television appearances built in the new four-year ABC contract, and the NCAA playoffs for I-AA.

There are \$3-million worth of rights set aside for the next four years. I urge reconsideration of No. 27-B and a ruling to keep the basketball schools out of the vote. I urge your reconsideration.

**Andrew Mooradian** (University of New Hampshire): I would like to speak in behalf of the so-called "brown paddle schools." In 1973, when the criterion was set up for self-determination of basketball, there were approximately 50 schools who were placed into a "brown paddle" category.

Colleges like the "brown paddle schools" have enjoyed national championships in football. Our programs differ a great deal from the self-determined schools in Division II. The "brown paddle" programs will probably hurt Division II schools. We have asked the NCAA, the Reclassification Committee, to help us.

This plan does answer our problems. The "brown paddle schools" have offered no amendments on any criteria. We were basically trying to get out.

**Stephen Horn** (University of California, Long Beach): I would hope that this Convention would oppose reconsideration. The fact is as we look at the votes that have been cast today, I think it is very hard at this time for the delegates to reconsider without having thought about it and talked about the full impact of the various matters of the Ivy League amendment, and what has been voted up and down. The fact is

that many of these votes have been decided within three votes, within five votes, etc.

As we have listened to some of the roll calls, we have seen at least five, perhaps more institutions, where their philosophical position was one way but they had to vote the other way on the roll call. They told the staff that is why we went for a secret roll call because of the scheduling intimidation and threats against them down the line.

Frankly, if the chair, who was requested to rule out basketball playing schools does that, I think that would be a great disservice. I am sure the chair will not do it. I would hope our friends in basketball-playing schools in Division I would realize, as they can see in a few of the amendments offered today, what is down the line as people try to set criteria for you and try to give you the squeeze play just as they are attempting to in the football schools in Division I.

With that, I would hope that we would keep the vote at least as it was, 142 against reconsideration and 115 still wanting to be misguided.

**Robert Leestamper** (Southeast Missouri State University): If it is the ruling of the chair that the "brown paddle" institutions cannot vote on this, will they be able to vote in Division II, then? If so, I would want to request that opportunity. They are going to have to vote some place. I don't know if you are reviewing the rules or what. You have not yet ruled on that, and I am wondering if you are planning on doing that?

**President Thompson:** We will rule that when it does become germane. But I will quickly say to you that they have their vote in Division I.

**James Drinnon** (University of Tennessee, Chattanooga): Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to move that the motion on the floor be tabled to the first item on the agenda in the morning so that we will have ample opportunity? We have passed a lot of legislation dealing with this today and I would like to have time to reflect on what has happened so that I might be able to cast a more intelligent vote when this issue is discussed.

[The motion was seconded, voted on and defeated.]

**John Toner** (University of Connecticut): Mr. Chairman, what has been said here by the gentleman from Alcorn State today and by my colleagues of the many conferences is very important. No. 27-A passed, which increases the schedule requirements and further makes it important that No. 27-B be reconsidered. On behalf of those schools who are making every effort they can to remain in their playing conference when their conference games can't count toward that qualification and then play as many nonconference I-A opponents or I-AA opponents necessary to be reclassified in Division I, this is very, very important just on that matter of principle beginning with the reorganization in the three divisions, as this Association saw years ago to do. I am in favor of reconsideration.

[The motion to reconsider proposal No. 27-B (page A-17) was approved.]

**Jack Davis** (Oregon State University): I would ask for a ruling of the chair. Can we join item 27-D with No. 27-B at this time so that we can



simultaneously consider the permanent amendment? This would offer the Convention the opportunity to look at the entire package. If it is necessary, I would move that Nos. 27-D and 27-B be joined.

[The motion was seconded.]

**President Thompson:** Our interpretation is that this would join two separate matters; although related, they were not structured that way and they can stand separately. We do not know of any way they could be joined. My parliamentarian advises me further that this would change the pattern of reconsideration insofar as Divisions II and III are concerned. This confuses the picture. Thus, we would have to go back to Divisions II and III under those conditions.

**John Simpson** (Boston University): I rise to speak for reconsideration of No. 27-B and I urge my colleagues in those basketball schools who just a few moments ago asked for support of No. 27-E, citing the fact they wanted to determine their own destiny in basketball, grant us the same privilege. As one of the 50 or so schools that do not have that determination, with our entire program of 16 varsity sports in Division I except football, that is the only vehicle that can give to us the status we want.

So I urge support of reconsideration of No. 27-B and again urge my colleagues in those basketball schools that turnout is fair play.

[Proposal No. 27-B (pages A-17-18) was approved.]

**John Toner** (University of Connecticut): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 27-C.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment amends Bylaw 11-1-(d) and merely extends the present legislation regarding football legislation in Division I to include a new Division I-A and I-AA football classification. It says that only Division I-A members may submit football legislation for Division I-A, and only those members may vote on such legislation.

The same would be true for Division I-AA. Like No. 27-B, this appears as a common bylaw and, therefore, must be approved separately by each of the three divisions.

**Carl Maddox** (Louisiana State): I know I am going over plowed ground, which has been plowed by Wayne Duke and my friend from Alcorn State, but the vote this morning was 115 yes and 142 no. There are only 156 football schools in Division I. So that means there were 101 "white paddle schools" that defeated this proposal the first time around.

[Proposal No. 27-C (page A-18) was approved.]

**Mr. Toner:** I move adoption of No. 27-D.

[The motion was seconded.]

**President Thompson:** I should like to call to your attention that there are several amendments. The first one is proposal No. 30.

**Dick Oliver** (Southland Conference): As one of the sponsors, we would like to withdraw No. 30.

[Proposal No. 30 (page A-23) was withdrawn.]

**Frank Bonner** (Furman University): I move the adoption of No. 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 31 (page A-23) was defeated, 64-72.]

**Samuel Whitman** (Tennessee State University): I move No. 27-5 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am sure the representatives of similar schools and institutions and conferences feel that a change in just a few words in the order of the present rules will help us a great deal in meeting the immediate membership criteria. We would like to change the wording and requirements from more than 50 per cent of the games in Division I to at least 50 per cent of the games in Division I.

[Proposal No. 27-5 (page A-18) was defeated, 45-68.]

**Mr. Bonner:** Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of No. 32.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think, Mr. Chairman, the rationale behind this proposal is obvious. It does provide a safeguard which Division I—that is including I-A and I-AA football—should not object to, because the rescission of anything passed regarding football in those two subdivisions would require a two-thirds vote of the combined I-A and I-AA.

Therefore, we certainly hope that all those that would be classified in I-A and I-AA will support this.

**Richard Lyman** (Stanford University): I think there is not only to be said for this that it is a very practical step to take, but I think we all are aware there has been a certain amount of bitterness in the air today, and that is not likely to disappear with the wave of the wand. I think this is a good time to remind ourselves that there is a lot to unify us in this room.

We all care about intercollegiate sports in this country and we all care about the future of an effective NCAA. A vote for this Furman amendment would be a very fine moment at which to do something of a healing nature that brings us back together again and strengthens our future as an overall organization. I urge the support of this amendment.

[Proposal No. 32 (page A-23) was approved.]

**Mr. Toner:** It might be helpful to know this proposal No. 27-D establishes initial criteria for the classification in the new Division I-AA football subdivision. Those criteria would require I-AA football members to sponsor eight sports in Division I including football. The same sports sponsorship requirement would be extended to Division I-A football.

The second criterion would require the Division I-AA football member to schedule more than 50 per cent of its games in Division I-A football or I-AA football. I might add that an opportunity will be given for any of the "brown paddle schools," as well as any member of Division I football, who within 60 days or at the end of this Convention should all of No. 27 pass in terms of football, to choose I-A or I-AA in football by this act, and then count the competition play against one another. I would urge the adoption of No. 27-D.

[Proposal No. 27-D (page A-18) was approved.]

**Mr. Toner:** I move the adoption of No. 27-I.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amends Bylaw 9-1 by adding the indicated new paragraph. This amendment provides relief to two types of institutions which might be affected by the I-A and I-AA divisional structure in Division I football. Essentially, it provides that an institution in I-AA football which does not want to be governed by the rules of that subdivision may petition annually to use Division I-A football rules instead.

By doing so, it gives up its right for a Division I-AA ranking championship and television appearances, although it votes on football issues in I-AA. It can, however, in its annual request for Division I-A classification be eligible for weekly statistical reports as well as eligible on its own merit basis for I-A television.

The two types of institutions which might want to use this provision are those which because of scheduling could have difficulties being restricted by eventual Division I-AA limits on grants, recruiting, coaches and the like. The group might include an institution which can't meet the Division I-A criteria but which traditionally plays Division I-A opponents or intends to increase its I-A scheduling to be able to compete at the I-A level.

[Proposal No. 27-I (page A-21) was approved.]

#### **Resolution: Division I-AA Football**

**John Mahstede** (Iowa State University): I move adoption of resolution No. 36.

[The motion was seconded.]

This gives the NCAA Executive Committee authorization to conduct a mail ballot of those institutions declaring I-AA football as their desired classification within 60 days of the Convention adjournment, to determine their interest in a Division I-AA football championship and a separate football statistics program for that subdivision; further, that the NCAA Executive Committee be authorized to establish pilot programs in those two areas for the 1978 football season if a majority of those responding to the mail ballot favor those programs. This is the source from the NCAA Council.

[Resolution No. 36 (page A-24) was approved.]

#### **Multidivision Classification**

**Wiles Hallock** (Pacific-8 Conference): Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that No. 27-E failed and No. 37-A is now moot, I would ask that No. 37-B be withdrawn.

[Proposal No. 37-B-C-D (page A-25) was withdrawn.]

#### **Division II Criteria**

**President Thompson:** The suggestion from the chair is to ask for unanimous consent of consideration of No. 40 ahead of No. 39 in view that the first paragraph of No. 40 has been withdrawn. Have I stated that correctly? Do I have unanimous consent to do that? Any

objections? Hearing no objections, we will proceed with No. 40.

**Lou Comer** (California Collegiate Athletic Association): I would like to move No. 40-A and then No. 40-B.

[The motion was seconded.]

Very briefly, Division II has been devoid for any criteria for membership except the scholarship limitation. We felt that to be a viable member of Division II, an institution should sponsor six intercollegiate sports in Division II and should also schedule at least 60 per cent of its contests against Division II members.

We have seen institutions which in the past have created problems in selection of national championship competitors because of the lack of criteria.

I wish first to vote on paragraph (a) and then on paragraph (b).

**President Thompson:** We will have a division of the question on No. 40. As you know, the first part has been withdrawn. He is only moving paragraphs (a) and (b). Paragraph (a) is before you at this time. This is a vote of Division II only.

[Paragraph (a) of Proposal No. 40 (page A-28) was approved.]

**John Eiler** (East Stroudsburg State College): In regard to paragraph (b) of No. 40, I have no argument with the change in the number of sports required, but I would like to call to the attention of the membership that a number of Division II schools experience problems with the scheduling criteria.

Now, because of locked-in conference schedules and geographic locations, this will create a hardship for some of the Division II schools. There are some conferences who have almost an equal division of Division II and Division III schools within their conference. Consequently, it will make it very difficult for them in many instances to reach the 60 per cent requirement.

If you will look at proposal No. 39, you will find there will be relief, so I would like to have you peruse this a little bit before you make your decision.

**Rudy Carvajal** (California State College, Bakersfield): The purpose of our legislation is to make the effective date the same as noted in proposal No. 39, a three-year compliance provision.

**Stanley Marshall** (South Dakota State University): I urge Division II members to defeat this proposal and support No. 39 developed by the Steering Committee. We have struggled for several years to attempt to develop criteria for Division II, and by passing paragraph (b) we may upset the delegate ballot at which they have arrived. I urge your defeat of (b) and your support of No. 39.

[Paragraph (b) of Proposal No. 40 (page A-23) was defeated.]

#### **Division II Criteria**

**Mr. Eiler:** Mr. President, I would like to move approval of proposal No. 39 as drawn up by the Division II Steering Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the general round table yesterday, I mentioned the fact the

Division II Steering Committee had done a survey of the Division II schools in an effort to come up with the criteria that we need to meet all their needs. Proposal No. 39 is a result of that study, and I would just like to briefly go over these things and bring it to your attention on what we are trying to do.

Proposal No. 39 indicates that schools must sponsor a minimum of five intercollegiate varsity sports. The sports must be among those for which the Association sponsors a championship and must be recognized by the institution, they must be varsity intercollegiate sports, and must involve all-male teams or mixed teams, male and female. Each sport must engage in a minimum number of intercollegiate contests. Those minimums, by the way, are as a result of a survey that was made in 1975 by an NCAA Committee on length of season.

These are not numbers that were grabbed up in thin air, but were looked over very carefully; and we tried to fit them into the pattern of most of the Division II schools. The institution's team and individual sports include a minimum of participants in each contest to be counted.

Each game in a doubleheader or tripleheader in a tournament is to count as one contest. In individual sports, each institution vs. institution shall be counted in any multiteam competition as one contest. If you are competing in a relay and there is no score kept against each individual team, that will not count as an individual contest.

The same sport in two different seasons of the same academic year may be counted if listed on the official schedules. In other words, if you have a fall baseball season and a spring baseball season, both may be counted in your total games. Also, no doubleheaders would count in baseball. Some of the schools in other areas felt there might be a hardship imposed upon them with the number of baseball games.

I think that if they considered the fall and winter seasons, plus the fact that doubleheaders will count, they can come pretty close to those numbers. The Council, by a two-thirds vote, approved the exception to the number of contests and the number of participants if at any time because of adverse weather conditions, because of injury or illness at the site of the competition or because of some disaster the contest may not be completed.

One more thing that appears: self-credit for indoor or outdoor track is permissible if a team participates in a total of at least 10 indoor and outdoor meets through the year, with at least three indoor and three outdoor meets included in the total of 10. Now, we have given considerable thought to this criteria. This is our first attempt to come up with something that is constructive in regard to Division II criteria, and we would hope that the Convention will support it.

**President Thompson:** John, before you leave, I think I detected in the early part of your statement, you said five sports, whereas, now we have amended it to say six sports.

[Paragraph (b) of proposal No. 39 (page A-28) was approved.]

#### Division III Criteria

**Edward Malan** (Pomona-Pitzer Colleges): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of proposal No. 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chairman, this simply adds to the current criteria for Division III of financial aid based on need scheduling criteria in the sports of football and basketball to assure that Division III members play a majority of contests against each other. For those with difficulties in meeting the requirements by virtue of geographical problems, a waiver provision is written in for both sports.

**President Thompson:** I should call to your attention that this question will have to be divided into two parts, A and B, because the voting is separate. You will note in 41-A, the voting will be by Division II football only and 41-B will be Division III only.

**Robert Peck** (Williams College): I think Division III has operated without this kind of rule, our basic rule being the need formula. I would urge the membership not to put these restrictions in. I realize we can have waivers for divisional problems, but I fail to see any such problems. I have not heard any persuasive reasons why we need this extra legislation, so I urge Division III members to vote against it.

[Proposal No. 41-A (page A-29) was approved by Division III football, 47-41.]

**Michael Brighia** (Glassboro State College): Mr. Chairman, I believe that each of us in Division III appreciates what the Division III Steering Committee is doing, but we ask that they rework this proposal. We believe that 75 per cent is a number perhaps paralleling the previous proposals that have been presented in the other divisions, but in Division III we have so many geographical differences that we think this should be looked at.

There should be no reason why somebody in Division III couldn't play at least eight out of the 25 basketball games against somebody in Division II. We ask its defeat.

[Proposal No. 41-B (page A-29) was defeated.]

#### Division III Criteria

**Kenneth Weller** (Central College): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 42, which amends Article 9 of the bylaws.

[The motion was seconded.]

I request that this proposal be divided. It has two distinct parts, and I think by treating them separately we can best achieve it. I would divide it into two parts, the first part ending with the words "U.S. Office of Education" in the fourth line.

The first part deals with the system of determining the financial need of student-athletes. Our current bylaws provide for it to be done through the Parent's Confidential Statement. That system is obsolete and, therefore, it is urgent that we adopt the proposal which uses the currently operating need system.

In addition, a number of our institutions are using different analyses for determining need. The steering committee feels that all systems which are approved by the Department of Education are satisfactory for use by our membership. These are all based upon the uniform methodology which is described in the appendix in the program, and

they all must stand up to a review.

They all must be within \$50 using the uniform methodology. We feel that it would be very advantageous for the members to continue to use that program they are now using.

[Proposal No. 42-A (page A-30) was approved.]

**Mr. Weller:** Part B deals with two exceptions to aid based on need. There have been two problems that have arisen, and the steering committee has drafted this legislation to try to handle it. The first deals with the exception for academic scholarships, and we would like to clarify that exemption.

The clarification is needed because there are some institutions that are interpreting the fact that anyone in the top 20 per cent can get an academic scholarship. This is designed to make it very clear that the academic scholarship which can be given without reference to need must be a part of the normal academic scholarship program of the institution.

The second problem that we have covered is dealt with in the past paragraph. This is the problem that arises at a number of institutions that are required to discriminate against athletes. What has happened is that a student-athlete is entitled to a scholarship or grant based on some characteristics of his circumstances as a student. The need provisions of our bylaws though, make it necessary for him to reject the grant without destroying his eligibility participation.

For example, a number of institutions have a program for a son or daughter of an alumnus. If that person is entitled to a scholarship and he has no need, it is perfectly all right if he doesn't compete in athletics. But if he wants to compete in athletics, he must reject that scholarship. Since this is somewhat unusual in nature, we have made sure that we require that any such program must have the authorization of the Council to prevent any possible abuse.

[Proposal No. 42-B (page A-30) was approved.]

[Proposals Nos. 43 and 44 (pages A-30-31) were withdrawn.]

#### **Allied Divisional Membership**

**William J. Flynn** (Boston College): Mr. President, I move adoption of proposal No. 45.

[The motion was seconded.]

Several years ago when the NCAA organized into three divisions, we adopted Bylaw 7-7-(b), to determine in which division allied members would vote. The Eastern College Athletic Conference, which has more than one-fourth of the NCAA membership, namely, 67 members in Division I, 48 in Division II and 113 in Division III, was, therefore, classified to vote in Division III.

However, last year, the division in which a team was used not only for what division a conference would vote in but whether or not a conference would be permitted to obtain automatic qualification in a national championship. With the approval of legislation last year, the 67 Division I schools in the ECAC could possibly be denied the right to participate in ECAC competitions that would lead to automatic

qualification in Division I in the NCAA championships.

This amendment would allow a conference with a minimum of 25 institutions in a particular division to declare that conference a member of that division. If this does not pass, then the ECAC will be denied automatic qualification and a great deal of damage will be done to these teams.

The ECAC is not seeking new automatic qualifications, only to retain the ones that they currently have. Therefore, in fairness to so many Division I members in the ECAC, I urge you to vote for this amendment.

[Proposal No. 45 (pages A-31-32) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 46 (page A-32) was withdrawn.]

#### **Multidivision Classification**

**Ron Petro** (Marist College): I move adoption of proposal No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently in our constitution, there is no provision for a Division III institution to compete in Division II in any one sport. Division III institutions can move to Division I in the sports but not to Division II. Why do we have legislation allowing a Division III school to choose one sport and participate in Division I but not Division II?

With the new criteria for financial aid in Division II going into effect in 1979, it seems unfair to allow member institutions to support a team with athletic assistance but not determine its level of competition. If an institution makes a financial commitment to a sport, why shouldn't that institution be able to choose its own level of competition?

It is unreasonable for a Division III school to jump to a Division I schedule. It is extremely difficult to schedule Division I members. However, if a school wants to support one sport financially, it is less expensive and easier to schedule in Division II.

I urge you to allow the small colleges to move one sport to a higher-level competition, that is Division II, while remaining in Division III in all other sports except football.

**Thomas Niland** (LeMoyne College): I would agree with the proposal that we allow them to move, except in the sports of football or basketball. I do believe there is quite a distinction between the fact that they want to move up from Division III to Division II in a sport other than football. It includes basketball, and that changes the situation. I am opposed to this proposal.

**Mr. Petro:** Basketball is the sport in which we probably will be giving scholarships, thereby enabling us to move up in basketball which is an income-producing sport.

[Proposal No. 47 (pages A-32-33) was defeated by Divisions II and III and approved by Division I. Since approval by all divisions was required, the proposal failed.]

#### **Financial Aid—BEOG**

**Charley Scott** (University of Alabama): I move proposal No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

I learned last year the solution which seems simple doesn't always prevail. This proposal provides for simplification, I believe, in the handling of Basic Educational Opportunity Grants. It proposes to handle BEOG in the same way as financial assistance from such things as the GI Bill, ROTC, the National Guard, the Orphan's Education Program, Social Security and perhaps some others. In view of my thoughts, I found no logic in what we are doing currently in the legislation.

We exempt financial support, for example, that results from an athlete who is an orphan or the father who died in military action, or otherwise, but we do not exempt financial support that may result from a father who ran off and left his family and fails to support him.

Secondly, it seems to me, what we are doing currently with BEOG ties the NCAA directly with the federally supported program. Also, some may find it unthinkable for a student to receive the amount of funding support that may result from the total of the BEOG in a scholarship.

There are two notes on that. I see no effort among us to make combinations with the other programs that compare with the combination we have with the BEOG. The second applications for BEOG require identification of all financial support. This is taken into consideration.

The fourth point is that misunderstandings have existed on this subject throughout the current year. I judge that from not any expertise on my part as far as the BEOG is concerned, but from comments which have been made and from my listening to various people. The BEOG directly, I understand, comes in as a late award, perhaps as late as April, and this apparently creates some very difficult problems.

First, there is the morale of the student who is required to repay the scholarship in order to receive a BEOG. I do see a violation of law if an institution tries to secure or retain a BEOG check in order to make sure that the amount does not exceed certain limits.

Then there is the problem of the senior, the student who has completed his work, who might receive one of these BEOGs. I don't know what you would do in that case. There are several court cases currently in existence. It is my understanding that all those except one are being held for decision on that one, so that the matter may be eventually decided in the courts.

I recommend your careful thinking about our inconsistencies of positions on these grants when you vote.

**Mickey Holmes** (Missouri Valley Conference): The exemption cited by Mr. Scott, contained within the particular constitutional provision, covers very few individuals. There are many BEOG recipients. If one was to study very thoroughly No. 48, he would quickly find that if it is adopted some very real recruiting inequities could exist throughout the country. Last year when we discussed BEOG, we called to your attention the fact that at the current time the maximum amount of the BEOG award, which is based upon the recipient's need, is \$1,400 a year or 50 per cent of the cost of education using the HEW-U.S. Office of

Education formula, whichever is less.

If you represent an institution that has a cost of education, using this formula, in excess of \$2,800 annually, your recipient with a zero index will receive \$1,400. If you represent an institution that has a cost of education of only \$2,000 annually, using this formula, the maximum amount an individual with a zero index could receive would be \$1,000. Therein lies the potential major recruiting implication.

One other aspect which makes us feel that we have to oppose No. 48 is that many of our institutions have used this to help cut the cost of financial aid. It has not been a matter of not making it available; it has been a matter of reducing the athletic grant. We have not been withholding the BEOG money. It has been the athletic grant money. Because of this, there has been a savings in cost, the overall cost of financial aid in football, basketball and all other sports within our programs.

My last point on this is that if you will look at Nos. 49 and 50, you will see that they both cover an inequity which was inadvertently created last year through the legislation which was adopted; an inequity because of an interpretation that came forth from the Council which was relative to the individual who lived off-campus if he was attending an institution that had a value of room and board in excess of the allowable under the BEOG formula.

That inequity is taken care of in both Nos. 49 and 50, and creates a situation where an individual living on-campus with the same eligibility index number is in a position to receive the same amount of money, and vice-versa, as the individual who lives off-campus.

Again, I reiterate and request that you very seriously consider, because of the major recruiting inequities in No. 48 and because of the potential inflationary aspects in No. 48, that you defeat it and thoroughly consider both No. 49 or No. 50.

[Proposal No. 48 (page A-33) was defeated.]

#### Financial Aid—BEOG

**James Frank** (Lincoln University, Missouri): On behalf of the Council, I should like to move proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council has sponsored this proposal to resolve the difference in the application of the present legislation to on- and off-campus students. Under the present rule, an off-campus student may not receive the amount of financial aid available to a student-athlete on campus because the BEOG cost-of-education formula sets a specific limit on the value of off-campus room and board that the student may receive.

This proposal would permit the combination of a student-athlete's BEOG award and his institutional aid to reach the value of tuition, fees, room and board, plus the amount assigned to miscellaneous expenses under the BEOG cost-of-education formula.

**Mr. Holmes:** I should like to ask either Bill Hunt or Dave Berst to answer this. Is the end result in No. 49 the same as No. 50, or would it be more appropriate to adopt both No. 49 and then as an official



interpretation of No. 49 also adopt No. 50 so that any potential loopholes might be eliminated?

**David Berst** (NCAA Director of Enforcement): I think No. 49 would cover all the bases. I think both proposals basically do the same thing. No. 50 may be a little more permissive. It gives you an option in regard to a student-athlete who lives off campus. I think if the membership were to adopt No. 49 it would solve the problems that you are concerned about; you would not need No. 50.

**Otto Breitenbach** (University of Wisconsin, Madison): It is the feeling of our financial aids office that we need both Nos. 49 and 50 in order to cover the two maximums being allowed at the same level for off campus and on campus, and we would like to recommend in order to be sure to eliminate the inequity that is currently existing, that both propositions be considered in a positive manner.

**President Thompson**: The advice is that we adopt both of them and ask the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to make the appropriate adjustment language-wise, and that will accomplish principally what you are adopting. Thus, we will say 49 and 50 are both in order.

[Proposal No. 49 (pages A-33-34) was approved.]

#### **BEOG Formula**

**Mr. Holmes**: I move adoption of No. 50, which adds a new O.I. following Constitution 3-4-(d)-(2)-(iv).

[The motion was seconded, and proposal No. 50 (page A-34) was approved.]

#### **Financial Aid Definition**

**Warren Schmakel** (Illinois State University): I move adoption of No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think the definition as we have it in this proposal is self-explanatory. We have a problem, as many of you do in your institutions, with regard to married athletes. At Illinois State University over the last few years, we have had three or four football players and a wrestler who was married with three children, and he had to give up his scholarship with us because of this particular regulation. He had to go out and work and accept financial aid through the university in order to get his education and support his family.

All we are asking for, basically, is to permit the student-athletes, including those with dependents, to receive the same amount of financial aid provided under such circumstances to nonathletes enrolled in the institution, and leave that determination up to the financial aid officer. Therefore, we ask that you support this financial aid change in definition.

[Proposal No. 51 (page A-34) was defeated.]

[The Convention recessed at 4:57 p.m.]

## **FINAL BUSINESS SESSION**

**Friday Morning, January 13, 1978**

The session convened at 9 a.m., President J. Neils Thompson presiding.

### **8. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS**

#### **Financial Aid Definition**

**Hugh Hindman** (Ohio State University): Mr. Chairman, I move proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Mr. Hindman** (Ohio State University): I move adoption of No. 52-1, amending No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent merely is to allow the use of course-related nonexpendable supplies to be handled in the same manner as textbooks.

[Proposal No. 52-1 (page A-35) was approved; proposal No. 52 (pages A-34-35), as amended by No. 52-1, was defeated, 204-105. A two-thirds majority was required for approval.]

[Proposal No. 53 (page A-35) was withdrawn.]

#### **Exempted Players**

**Merle Loken** (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I move proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

We request your support of this proposal, which has been introduced to expand the opportunities for young men to participate in athletic programs other than football and basketball. At present, the rules permit students who are not committed and receive financial aid not based on athletic ability, to be exempted from the maximum participants in a particular sport.

Proposal No. 54 would extend this exemption to recruited athletes who receive financial aid not based on athletic ability. We feel this rule change, that is permitting recruited athletes the same opportunities as nonrecruited athletes, is totally appropriate. It eliminates reference to recruitment, which I believe at best is very difficult to control or to evaluate.

The true "walk-on" is almost nonexistent inasmuch as it is very seldom that a student is not contacted by someone who might be considered a part of the university's athletic interests to talk with him about attending a particular university. Therefore, we request your support of proposal No. 54.

[Proposal No. 54 (page A-36) was approved by Divisions I and II.  
NOTE: Proposal No. 54 was subsequently reconsidered and de-

feated by Division I. The discussion of the reconsideration can be found following proposal No. 77.]

#### **Countable Player—Football**

**John Mahlstede** (Iowa State University): I move adoption of proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is submitted to broaden Case No. 296, the current interpretation of Bylaw 53, relating to the definition of longevity of the accountable player. It speaks to a problem that all of our institutions have experienced.

A young man comes out for two days and decides that football or university life as he has experienced them to that point in time was not what he had envisioned. He voluntarily withdraws from the institution. Amendment No. 55 proposes to allow your institution to award that player's grant to another student who is already enrolled and a member of the football team.

It is not enabling legislation for run-off. It applies to a student who voluntarily withdraws from the university prior to the first day of class or the first football game, whichever comes first. I solicit your support to this proposal.

[Proposal No. 55 (page A-36) was approved.]

[Proposals Nos. 56 and 57 (pages A-37-38) were withdrawn.]

#### **Determination of Financial Need**

**Frank Remington** (University of Wisconsin, Madison): I move adoption of proposal No. 58.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, this proposal was before the Convention last year and was defeated at that time. It is again proposed for the consideration of the Convention. It proposes a need limitation on scholarships in sports other than football and basketball.

We learned this week that representatives of women's athletics voted to go from a need, tuition and books formula to a full-grant program. That seems to me to be both athletically unnecessary and fiscally unfortunate, to say the least. In all candor, I think we have to realize that the responsibility for that change lies in a very major way with this group.

Our failure to take action left the representatives of women's athletics with only one opportunity if they are to achieve equality. I indicate I think that is both unnecessary and will present major, perhaps insoluble physical problems for our universities. This proposal will enable both men and women's athletics to function in a way that is both fair to the individual athlete and, in my view, will make it possible to maintain the physical integrity of our athletic programs.

**Charles Sampson** (Texas A & M University): I speak in opposition to the proposed amendment. While there would be no substantial cost involved administering the program and ensuring equity, in my opinion, there is a more important consideration. Let us not place sports

other than football and basketball in a second-class status.

It is implying these sports are not as worthwhile as football and basketball. It seems to me if we were to approve this legislation we could, and probably would, find ourselves in circumstances at our institutions where full scholarships could be provided for football and basketball and, as already mentioned, in all women's varsity sports, without regard to need.

It would isolate men's sports other than football and basketball and limit severely the opportunity for scholarship help. Even with academic scholarships, the amount of aid and consideration of need is an institutional matter. We would, in effect, I think, be saying to the outstanding swimmers, ice hockey players, golfers, shot putters and so on that their talents, even though perhaps national-championship or world-class caliber, cannot be recognized to the degree of the others. I acknowledge if we are to economize, let's find other means to do it.

**Stanley Marshall** (South Dakota State University): I certainly hope that Division II will support this legislation to save the broad sports program that the gentleman just talked about. Those of us who are experiencing financial difficulty in sponsoring a broad sports program for men and women, yesterday or the day before got the news that we must increase our broad sports program for women.

Now, in order to save the broad sports program for men, we have to make cuts some place. I personally prefer cutting the grants as described rather than cutting sports. I think it is absolutely essential to pass this legislation in Division II in order to save the broad sports program.

**Hindman Wall** (Tulane University): The American Association of College Baseball Coaches is comprised of more than 1,900 baseball coaches representing NCAA colleges and universities and affiliated organizations. The following statement represents the strong feeling of that association in reaction to proposal No. 58 on Determination of Financial Aid.

"The AACBC is on record and we do again confirm that we pledge our support to changes and modifications of policy that will truly save needed money without sacrificing the overall welfare of the student-athlete, the welfare of the institution or the generally accepted principles and values of athletics.

"We have consistently and energetically sought participation of student-athletes in sports programs. We urge recognition and reward for academic excellence and greater public acceptance and support of high school and college athletics."

The record further shows that various conferences and institutions have made appropriate limitations consistent with regional problems on travel, squad size, number of playing dates, off season practice, financial aid and recruiting. The AACBC has declared overwhelmingly its objection to proposal No. 58 and believes the passage will necessarily nullify and defeat the goals of the AACBC without substantial financial savings.

It seems some administrators are arguing that the values of partici-

pation in some sports must now be subsidized by economic considerations. This adds up to a need of tragic equation that will be felt mostly by the student-athlete. The NCAA legislation in recent years has improved the distribution and alignment of college baseball which, in turn, has brought improved and more equitable regional and national play to thousands of college players. The public interest and financial support of baseball playouts in Divisions I, II and III has grown each year to record levels.

Any legislation that would set further limits on financial aid would cause serious setbacks in the dramatic growth of college baseball. If No. 58 is passed, it would cause qualified student-athletes to opt for junior college baseball. It would be a lesser incentive for the student to compete in what we all regard as worthwhile athletic participation.

The baseball counterparts are allowed to receive more financial aid and this discourages college baseball coaches who are building their programs to acceptable and admired levels. The AACBC respectfully requests the NCAA not to limit further financial aid in baseball. We have already endured two restrictions in the past five years.

Allow each institution to regulate the baseball financial aid within its present parameters. We express confidence in the discretion and integrity of institutional administration in matters of financial aid for baseball. The approval of proposal No. 58 would be extremely detrimental to baseball and all other nonrevenue sports. Gentlemen, I urge you to recall to mind the difficulty of "based on need" and consider the prestige and welfare of your total athletic program, and vote against proposal No. 58.

**Charles Neinas** (Big Eight Conference): Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to proposal No. 58. With the indulgence of the chair and, hopefully, without incurring the wrath of Mr. Remington who so ably represents my alma mater, and to save the time of the Convention, I would like to expand my remarks to cover No. 59 and offer general comments about the efforts to increase the maximum awards limitations as proposed in proposals Nos. 61 through 74.

In an analysis of what has transpired with the adoption of equivalency grant support, has been most interesting. It is doubtful that our experience in the Big Eight is significantly different from others. In the effort to maximize the use of available money, the coaches and directors have given considered attention to the distribution of financial aid in sports other than football and basketball.

To a degree, they have developed an informal need system, one which is covered by a myriad of regulations and a necessity of confidential financial status. I am not so naive to fail to recognize that the highly talented athletes will receive more assistance than others. But it is interesting to note if you study the situation that an attempt has been made to provide some type of assistance to the maximum number of students, and in so doing coaches and directors have made a thoughtful evaluation of an individual's financial background in determining equivalency.

Relative to proposal No. 59, I would be the first to admit that I may not completely understand its thrust. However, further evaluation of

the situation could result in a finding that institutions currently are receiving more for less money in the actual programs of today, than in the theoretical approach in No. 59.

We are all concerned about what lies ahead in the financing of intercollegiate athletics. The nonrevenue sports may particularly be vulnerable with the emergence and development of women's programs. In the not too distant future, it may be necessary to consider the reduction or even removal of grant limits in all sports other than football and basketball.

Such an option should be viewed as a possible economy measure rather than an expansion of funding. Let me explain. In many institutions, the NCAA maximum grant limits have become the minimum in the eyes of the coaches. Naturally, if there is a limit a coach will want as much as the next fellow, and will the NCAA limits be viewed as the minimum limits for women?

Institutions have or soon will be required to assess their own situation and evaluate how to best utilize the resources to fit their particular needs. Consequently, the time may not be too far away when we should revert to the proposition that each institution can best understand what is best for its particular program.

First, I do not find it distasteful if an institution wishes to place more emphasis on a certain sport than others in its program. Justifiably, you have Southern California with its track program, Oklahoma State with wrestling and Arizona with baseball. They should have the right to decide if they wish to continue emphasis in such sports.

The conference I represent has often been cited by some in this assembly, sometimes in public and probably more often in private, as wanting unlimited grants, particularly in football. Let me assure the membership that our resources are not unlimited.

There have been numerous comments about the 30-95 rule and its effect. Last year, the Big Eight Conference was cited at this Convention for its balance in football, and we hope that balance will continue to exist. The Big Eight is not opposed to fair and practical grant limits in football. The 30-95 rule, however, may not be perfect.

Research during the past few years convinced me that adjustments in the current system are mandatory if the competitive balance that is frequently mentioned in this Convention is to prevail. Such adjustments, in my opinion, can be accomplished without any significant change in numbers. Additional research and discussion can develop the flexibility required to maintain a semblance of balance without destroying the economic safeguards of limitations.

In summary, it would appear the wisest course for the NCAA Convention to pursue at this time is the status quo, and a "no" vote on proposals Nos. 58 through 74 will accomplish that objective.

**Robert Ray** (University of Iowa): Mr. President, I rise in support of proposal No. 58. It would seem to me that the time has come for this Association to take some leadership in an effort to achieve a common ground for those involved in women's athletics. The action they took in this city last week shows me the handwriting on the wall.

We are in a position now, I believe, where either we shall have sufficient funds to provide everyone full aid, which I doubt possible; or we shall move to a position of bankruptcy or mediocrity, and I am opposed to that as well. Let's take a positive step forward today and pass this legislation.

I believe that the AIAW will follow suit quickly. Keep in mind that this proposition does allow tuition and fees regardless of need, and that need enters the picture only if it exceeds those amounts. There is no reason to believe that any athletic program will suffer greatly that has achieved greatness in terms of a particular sport.

Surely those great coaches and that great institutional tradition will carry forward under these circumstances. This is a proposal of fairness and equity. I urge Divisions I and II to support it.

**Richard Perry** (University of Southern California): I would like to speak in opposition to No. 58. I would like to remind the delegates that for the past two Conventions, the Teddy Roosevelt recipient has been an individual directly involved with our Olympic movement. We were reminded by this year's Teddy recipient the "shake the tree" theory will not cut the mustard as far as our Olympic endeavors are concerned; we can't shake the tree every four years and expect Olympic world-class athletes to fall out of that tree.

We were reminded by that award-winner that the responsibility of this organization is to continue this effort. I fully concur with this and feel that No. 58, if passed, would be very detrimental to our best interest in that endeavor.

**Edwin Cady** (Duke University): We have just finished making a five-year budget forecast in athletics, and the results are simply frightening. Unless you assume that some sort of magic wand is going to wave and stop what has been the normal course of inflation in this country, we are going to be facing financial problems which cannot be solved under any circumstances except by some such force as the one proposed today. My guess is if we don't get need this time we will get it next time.

If we get it this time, we will get more further down the line. Those are exactly the reasons the gentleman has been citing—we have to make opportunities available for people who participate in the sports that don't make money. What I am saying is perfectly plain. Unless we find real ways to cut our costs, we shall be out of business in the quite easily foreseeable future and the people who would have had an opportunity to participate as NCAA competitives in these other sports will simply be playing club sports.

The whole operation that we have entered into, the broadly based programs you have been talking about, will be out of business.

[Proposal No. 58 (pages A-38-39-40) was defeated by Division I, 116-130; and by Division II, 45-54.]

[Proposals Nos. 59 and 60 (pages A-40-41-42) were withdrawn.]

#### **Maximum Awards—Division I Baseball**

**Wiles Hallock** (Pacific-8 Conference): I move proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

While speaking in advocacy of proposal No. 61, I am in effect speaking not only in behalf of baseball, but in behalf of Nos. 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68 and 69. You will be pleased to know that I am making this appeal only once and will not repeat it for those proposals.

First, I should like to emphasize that the Pac-8 Conference is not talking about changing the overall limitation of 80 proposed grants in sports other than football and basketball. It seems to us that this is important to stress because the total, we believe, goes to the overriding economic issue.

Secondly, the Pac-8 believes that the number of grants permissible in a sport ought to be tied to the number of participants that it takes to compete in that sport; that the quality of a team's performance should be allowed to reflect in a general way the quality of the excellent athletes being aided.

The figures we have recommended are more logical, we believe, than those adopted in August 1976, when absolute minimums in each sport were perhaps an overreaction of the economy Convention. Again, the 80 is the important figure, it seems to us, who are committed to the broadly based program.

If it takes 18 students to make up a viable baseball team, as the NCAA Council suggested to us in its reorganizational proposal last year (and we believe that is most equitable), an institution should be permitted, we believe, if it wishes to conduct high quality competition in baseball, to be able to award 18 full equivalency grants; again always bearing in mind that the total of 80 could enforce economy in the broadly based sports programs.

As Dick Perry of Southern California mentioned, we honored some great young men on Wednesday. We honored some outstanding Olympians. There hasn't been time yet for the restriction of sport-by-sport limitations we now have in effect to have a negative impact on the school college system contribution to our Olympic effort.

But the impact will come, we believe. Our Olympic effort must be supported with greater flexibility in those sports where we wish to put our financial aid. As Dick also said, we simply can't expect to shake the tree every four years and maintain our significant contribution to so many great sports. I urge your support of proposal No. 61 and those that follow.

[Proposal No. 61 (page A-42) was defeated.]

#### **Maximum Awards—Division I Track**

**Mr. Hallock:** I move proposal No. 62.

[The motion was seconded and defeated by Division I.]

#### **Maximum Awards—Division I Fencing**

**Mr. Hallock:** I move proposal No. 63.

[The motion was seconded and defeated by Division I.]

#### **Maximum Awards—Division I Gymnastics**

**Mr. Hallock:** I move adoption of proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded and defeated by Division I.]

#### **Maximum Awards—Division I Ice Hockey**

**Otto Breitenbach** (University of Wisconsin, Madison): I would like to move adoption of proposal No. 65.

[The motion was seconded.]

The sport of ice hockey in our particular institutions operates with 20 grants right now, and is within the maximum of 80. In order to participate in hockey, we have six regulars, it is true, but it really takes 18 players plus a goalie to participate in a given game.

In other words, we are using our full maximum in every game over a season of 36 games. Now, I would like to note this is a contact sport and we do need additional bodies. The three extra grants would be of considerable assistance to this program. I also would like to note that ice hockey at the University of Wisconsin is the No. 2 income sport in our program, and with many of the fine schools we compete it is the No. 1 income sport in their programs.

It helps to finance the total programs at those institutions. On the basis of the uniqueness of this program, I urge the Convention to consider increasing ice hockey grants from 20 to 23.

[Proposal No. 65 (page A-43) was defeated by Division I.]

[Proposals Nos. 66 through 69 (pages A-43-44) were withdrawn.]

#### **Maximum Awards—Division I Tennis**

**J. D. Morgan** (University of California, Los Angeles): I move that No. 70 be approved.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the sport of tennis, the coaches, along with the NCAA Tennis Committee, and with the approval of the Executive Committee, have changed the format of the national championships. It is now a sport in which 16 teams are picked to participate for a true national team championship, with six singles and three doubles teams in competition.

After that competition is finished, the top 64 players and the top 32 doubles teams compete with the individual championships. We are asking for only one more grant, in order to bring it in line with the actual format of the national championships as now conducted.

I sincerely urge the membership on this basis to give it great consideration and approval to this amendment.

[Proposal No. 70 (page A-44) was defeated by Division I, 82-129.]

[Proposals Nos. 71 and 72 (pages A-44-45) were withdrawn.]

#### **Maximum Awards—Division I Football**

**William Putnam** (University of South Carolina): Mr. President, I move proposal No. 73.

[The motion was seconded.]

Speaking in support of No. 73, it is our feeling that the 30-95 rule is

not too positive on the matter of high retention rate—quite to the contrary. No. 73 does maintain the 30 initial awards per year. We urge the delegates' consideration of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 73 (page A-45) was defeated by Division I football.]

#### **Maximum Awards—Division I Football**

**Jim Malik** (San Diego State University): I move adoption of proposal No. 74.

[The motion was seconded.]

Let me first clarify the intent of this proposal. If a Division I institution finds that it has on its list less than 90 student-athletes in football on grants during a given year, then the following year it may offer up to 35 initial grants, providing that it does not exceed the overall 95 limitation.

If a Division I school finds it has less than 80 student-athletes in football on grants during the given year, then in the following year it may offer up to 40 initial grants. However, these options can be exercised only twice in any four-year period, and only three times in any eight-year period.

This should effectively prevent any runoff problem. In fact, these options will have to be used discreetly. There are several reasons why this proposal is needed. There are institutions now which had considerably more than the 95 awards allowed when this rule went into effect. These institutions are trying to still catch up and increase their numbers.

If you have one or more for recruiting seasons or lose your coach with the usual large loss of players, there is real difficulty in trying to return to your original numbers. This proposal assists in these situations but it does not destroy the basic integrity of the limit of the 30 initial awards. It does not bring new financial demands upon any institution which is operating at its desired level. It does offer an opportunity in a somewhat shorter time to reach that level. I solicit your support for this proposal.

**Jack Davis** (Oregon State University): I would like to speak in opposition to this proposal. I think it is developing a system that would result in some problems. It is the wrong approach. The Pacific-8 Conference has a limit of 90 grants-in-aid and at my own institution, and most of the others in the Pac-8, we are going to be under 90.

So, you should recognize that if you vote for this, the Pac-8 would have a 35-89 sort of limitation. I can envision institutions working to achieve an 89 or a 79 limitation in order to get initials up. I think this is the wrong way to approach the problem.

[Proposal No. 74 (pages A-45-46) was defeated by Division I football.]

[Proposals Nos. 75 and 76 (page A-46) were withdrawn.]

#### **Maximum Awards—Division II Football**

**Robert Leestamper** (Southeast Missouri State University): I would like to object to the withdrawal of proposal No. 77.

**President Thompson:** All right. If that is the case, then you must move it.



**Mr. Leestamper:** I move proposal No. 77.

I would like to make comment to other proposals that have been mentioned regarding the number of participants in the varsity sports. I want to mention this it is not absolutely necessary that every person have a full grant-in-aid. There are conferences that have less than 60 now and are fielding teams. It means that some players do not have full grants.

What I would indicate, because of the reclassification and other factors, is that it is appropriate now to consider in Division II to move down to 45 grants from the current maximum of 60. There are a variety of reasons and not just economics. I think it will give greater differential between the different divisions. I would like for the conference to vote in favor of that.

[Proposal No. 77 (page A-47) was defeated by Division II football, 40-42.]

#### Exempted Players

**Charley Scott** (University of Alabama): Mr. Chairman, at the time that we went by No. 59, I did not realize fully the impact of it. If I may, I would like to object to the withdrawal of part 2 of No. 59. I move adoption of No. 59, part 2.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Andy Geiger** (University of Pennsylvania): I read the intent of No. 54 which exempts from the Bylaw 5 counting procedure those people mentioned in that attempt. Now, No. 59 tells us how to count people if you exempt from the counting procedures. I am a little confused as to how you do that.

**Cecil Coleman** (University of Illinois): On the first part, the (a) part of No. 59, what that did is go to a head count from equivalencies and established a number in (A)-1-(i) on the number of athletes that could be on grants, with financial aid or athletic ability was taken into consideration. Then part 2, a head count number on those that could be in the same sport.

So it had actually a doubling-up effect on those where athletic ability was not considered in giving any kind of financial aid. Now, I don't know if that question was asked or not, but that is the best explanation I can give you.

**Mr. Geiger:** My question is, if you eliminate these people from the counting procedure by passage of No. 54, how can you go back and establish procedures for counting the people that you eliminated to count?

**Mr. Coleman:** Mr. Chairman, that is the very reason I brought up as a point of clarification earlier when No. 54 passed, that it was my understanding No. 59-2 became moot. Then you ruled, no, it did not become moot, it could be brought up again. I am just as confused as Andy on that point.

**President Thompson:** Andy, I think the combined opinion up here is this simply puts a limitation on the number of exempt people as defined in No. 54. It puts a limiting number on that group. That is the

best opinion we can give at this point. Do you have any further comments now?

**Mr. Geiger:** Yes, sir. If No. 59-2 was passed, as I understand the ruling of the chair, a program such as ours, which has financial aid based on need and the financial aid is not administered by the athletic department, but is the same sort of aid packages administered for all students, would be limited by the numbers contained in the second part of No. 59.

That would be impossible. We would prefer in our situation, if that is the case, that we rescind or reconsider No. 54 and go back to the status quo that we had before we started this legislation to begin with.

**Mickey Holmes** (Missouri Valley Conference): I have one other question that is relative to the subparagraph (ii). In effect are we saying here that if you have in baseball 13 equivalencies, that you now can have under Bylaw 5, and then you have 13 others who fit into this counting category for baseball as contained in paragraph 2, we then are talking about 26 of the overall 80?

**Mr. Coleman:** To answer Mickey's question, there are two parts to it. There are 80 in each part. You are talking about 160. You are talking about athletic aid-related 13, plus 13 the other side in baseball, so you are talking about 160 and not 80.

**Mr. Geiger:** He is only talking about 80 for the schools which use aid based on need, though. We are caught in something that is trapped on one side or the other in this situation. If Mr. Scott would withdraw 59-2 I will move reconsideration of No. 54.

**Mr. Scott:** I will withdraw my motion.

**Mr. Geiger:** I move for reconsideration by Division I.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Ernest Casale** (Temple University): I want to know if I am correct in my interpretation, and maybe somebody can correct me if I am wrong. Under the present rule, for a student-athlete with aid not based on athletic ability and recruited, he counts when he first plays. This implies that there can be an unlimited number of such student-athletes on aid based on need. Once those athletes play they count.

The new regulation, this No. 59, changes it such that even if they play they don't count.

**Richard Lyman** (Stanford University): It seems to me if we don't reconsider and turn down No. 54, we are right back where we were, some unnumbered number of minutes ago with the sky as the limit on this, and a very difficult interpretation problem as to which is a recruited, academically aided student and otherwise.

Furthermore, overriding it does seem the amount of confusion we have had in our minds in the last few minutes should suggest that we go back to the status quo and rethink this thing all the way through. Therefore, I hope we will vote against No. 54 on this second round.

**Merle Loken** (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I would like to urge that we do not reconsider No. 54 since I think the issue is very clear. The issue, if we maintain No. 54 as we passed it, is that we do not discriminate against the student. He cannot be classified as a walk-on,

because somebody had spoken to them about attending a particular university.

I think all sorts of games are being played on the concept of recruitment. Whereas, I maintain that working through the financial aids office of a particular school, one cannot play games. At least not the games that can be played in this concept of the walk-on. Therefore, I urge that you turn down reconsideration of No. 54.

[The motion to reconsider proposal No. 54 was approved.]

**Richard Perry** (University of Southern California): I would like to speak in support of proposal No. 54 and ask that we maintain our position on that inasmuch as the body has consistently voted to provide opportunities for broadly based programs for large numbers of students. No. 54 gives relief without imposing any financial considerations on our various programs, with monies already available to other students.

It would be in the best interests of those sports other than football and basketball. We urge your support of No. 54.

**Jack Larsen**: (University of Southern California): Another aspect on No. 54. I would like to call the Convention's attention to the present language on Page 69 in the Manual, Bylaw 5-4-(b) and restate that material. What we are attempting to do in No. 54 is saying that the blurred distinction between the recruited and nonrecruited athlete is so blurred that it almost becomes impossible to distinguish.

Currently, the legislation excludes from counting the nonrecruited student-athlete who is given aid based in no manner on his athletic ability. But what No. 54 says, as my colleague from the Big Ten has attempted to stress, is because of the inability to clearly differentiate in most situations between the recruited and the nonrecruited student-athlete, paragraph (d) makes a great deal of sense. For that reason I urge support of No. 54.

**Mr. Lyman**: A point that has not been made. If we pass No. 54, there will be very different situations according to whether or not your university has scholarships that are not based on athletic ability. If you do have "no need" scholarships based on athletic ability, the sky will be much more than the limit, than if you required need.

It seems to me this further demonstrates that you have a confused situation. I agree with Jack Larsen there are blurs in the present situation and there will also be blurs aplenty if we pass No. 54. I am recommending we stay with the blur we have for at least this year and try to straighten this thing out.

[Upon reconsideration, proposal No. 54 (page A-36) was defeated by Division I.]

#### Five-Year Rule

**Chalmer Hixson** (Wayne State University): I move adoption of No. 78.

[The motion was seconded.]

Several times during this Convention we have heard that rules and procedures have changed to meet the new needs. I suggest to you that

higher education has changed considerably since our present five-calendar-year rule was inaugurated.

Because of that, we deny opportunity to participate in intercollegiate athletics to deserving students who have to interrupt their collegiate career for legitimate reasons. We count work in the supermarket for a year the same as participation in intercollegiate athletics by the five-calendar-year rule.

I suggest to you that educationally a five-year residency rule is much sounder. This does not mean that a student-athlete could play more seasons or more years at all. It doesn't change the transfer rule, or other similar rules. Further, although yesterday we almost rose above principle, we finally convinced ourselves that we do believe in the right of the units of this organization to decide their own destiny, even the subunits within the divisions.

Therefore, No. 78 provides that we can do that, take this five-year rule out of the constitution and place it in the bylaws for a divided vote. I urge you to pass this motion.

**John Semanik** (Drexel University): Our university is one of the largest co-op colleges in the country. I would like to get a clarification on this. We went to the 15 quarters as recommended here. Our students are regularly scheduled students, four quarters of each year.

This would, in effect, not give us five years as we now have it, which all our students must attend our university, but a shorter period of time; and, therefore, would not give our students an opportunity to play four years of intercollegiate competition. Is my interpretation correct?

**Mr. Hixson**: The intent of those for 15 quarters will be those quarters of the regular academic year and not summer.

**Mr. Semanik**: The summer quarter in our institution is part of the regular academic year.

**President Thompson**: The feeling is that we think you are making a correct point. Any further discussion?

**Harry Troxell** (Colorado State University): I rise to state opposition to proposal No. 78 for the Council. This is one of the few times that the Council has taken a position in this Convention. The five-year rule in its present form was adopted in 1969. One of the reasons for its adoption was to encourage student-athletes to avoid interrupting their education for long periods, while also providing an adequate time period to complete their eligibility in athletics.

The five-year rule has been successful in accomplishing this goal and has withstood scrutiny in the courts as being reasonable.

An obvious concern regarding this proposal is that it will eliminate any time requirement to complete eligibility in all three divisions. Further, this proposal could establish a different time-period requirement for competition in NCAA events, which we believe both undesirable and more difficult to administer and to defend in the courts.

**Robert Steidel** (University of California, Berkeley): I rise to speak in opposition to this motion. I believe the language would allow for more enrolling and dropping than you possibly could permit. I think

this could open an avenue where you could find very little performance coming out of all of it. I urge you to vote against this.

**John Hogan** (Colorado School of Mines): I would like to remind some of you this is 1978, in case you have forgotten, and a lot has happened since 1961. Father Joyce made the point yesterday that it is important for the NCAA to adapt to changing times. I don't hear enough emphasis on what will best help the student.

At our school, which has essentially an engineering curriculum, it is not at all uncommon for students to take six to seven years to complete their programs. This is chiefly because many students finance their own education and find it necessary to lay out once or twice in that six years. We talked about we can't do this or that. If a young man is to pay his own tuition, who are we to decide whether we can permit him to drop out or get back in? That is his own decision.

We are in a free country. I would recommend that we do adapt to the changing times and, too, I would recommend when we begin our logical process, our thought process, that we would first consider the student's benefit.

**Corey VanFleet** (Oakland University): The facts, as stated in the Chronicle of Higher Education, would indicate that in 1978 we have approximately 35 per cent of our students that are not completing their degrees in the college in which they originally enrolled. In addition, all across the country we are seeing the head counts rise while the credit hours per head count decrease. This indicates that the students, because of the nature of the curriculum and employment, must take longer to pass through and get their degrees.

The time seems to indicate that we need to provide those students who are providing their own funding, taking their time to go through school, and who still meet the criteria of full-time students the opportunity to continue in participation.

[Proposal No. 78-A (page A-47) was defeated; 78-B then became moot.]

#### Five-Year Rule

**Mr. Hixson** (Wayne State University): I move adoption of proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded; proposal No. 79 (page A-47) was defeated.]

#### Five-Year Rule

**John Reardon** (Harvard University): I move adoption of proposal No. 80.

[The motion was seconded.]

By this amendment, Harvard seeks to encourage the small degree of additional flexibility in the current five-year rule. In many ways, Harvard would prefer to see a complete revision of the five-year rule to recognize the rapidly changing patterns in enrollment today as we have heard in the previous discussion.

Our experience shows an ever-increasing number of students choos-

ing voluntarily to leave college subsequent to their initial matriculation for medical, financial, academic and purely personal reasons. This experience has shown overwhelmingly such an hiatus that is not beneficial in academic growth and personal growth to those students.

There has to be an exception made to the five-year rule. If the student chooses military service, this is allowed during his absence and he is granted eligibility beyond the five years. If the same student chooses to work in a hospital, to travel or to pursue some other worthwhile personal endeavor, he is not eligible. Our amendment, however, merely seeks to establish a simpler administrative process by which exemptions, other than those specifically listed, can be granted.

We have an example that causes us to seek this modest change. The student entered Harvard in September 1972, directly after his June 1972 graduation from high school. He was nonrecruited and did not participate in intercollegiate athletics during his first two years of residency. He took two years away from school for personal reasons, but with the approval and support of the administrative, academic and medical authorities of the college.

During this two-year hiatus, he worked for a local police force and for a congressman in Washington. He returned in 1976 and decided, with success, to participate in our intercollegiate fencing team. He hoped to continue that participation in 1977-78, as his final academic year; but he could not because the five-year rule prohibited intercollegiate participation for this student beyond June 1977.

We seek approval of this amendment to indicate to the Council and Eligibility Committee that appeals and exceptions such as this one can be considered and voted on according to their merits by those bodies rather than requiring such cases be brought to the full Convention for individual consideration.

**Harry Troxell** (Colorado State University): Speaking on behalf of the Council, we urge the membership not to adopt No. 80 in this form. The guidelines for waivers are not sufficiently defined. Also, the Council has determined that it will refer the question of the five-year rule to the steering committee of each division for study, with a view towards proposing legislation for the next Convention.

**Stephen Horn** (California State University, Long Beach): I would hope the Convention would adopt this and the Council could take it and designate a subcommittee to begin to deal with the cases and develop the criteria. The points made earlier on the Wayne State amendment are quite correct. Harvard, one of the great residential universities, has the same problem that the computer-oriented universities and colleges that are largely public have. We need some vehicle to solve these problems. I would think a year's experience by some designated subcommittee would give the guidelines to the Convention that are not based simply on abstract theory but actual practice. I would urge the Convention to approve this proposal.

[Proposal No. 80 (page A-48) was approved, 283-136.]

#### Five-Year Rule

**John Reeves** (Drew University): I would like to move adoption of

proposal No. 81.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal asks for a very specific situation to be added to the group of exemptions for the five-year rule, the Council's proposed modification in the five-year rule, because of lack of specificity. I hope this overcomes the objections.

The purpose of this proposal is to avoid penalizing a student whose education is interrupted for one year and who also has received a hardship waiver. Such an individual, if this proposal is adopted, would still be able to compete for four seasons; whereas, otherwise, his participation would be limited to three.

**Harry Troxell** (Colorado State University): Speaking on behalf of the Council, we urge the membership to vote against No. 81 in order to permit the steering committee here again to study the matter as it has already been described in the previous information submitted.

[Proposal No. 81 (page A-48) was defeated.]

[Proposal No. 82 (page A-48) was withdrawn.]

#### **Olympic Tryouts and Competition**

**Edgar Sherman** (Muskingum College): Mr. Chairman, I move proposal No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of proposal No. 83 is to eliminate the requirement that waivers be requested for participation in final Olympic tryouts and competition.

[Proposal No. 83 (pages A-49-50) was approved.]

#### **High School All-Star Games**

**Fred Jacoby** (Mid-American Conference): I would like to move adoption of No. 84.

[The motion was seconded.]

In a number of discussions with our coaches and also with the members of the Collegiate Commissioners' Association, we feel there is a real problem with high school all-star games. It is a problem that many of us have not wanted to address. We have talked about it but really never done anything about it. All-star games have proliferated in recent years, primarily in basketball.

They include one city vs. another city, one conference vs. another conference, one state vs. another state and even the United States vs. another country. Now the problems, as we see them, are the following. Number one, taking the high school class time for practices and games. Number two, since many all-star games are played on weekends, the athletes visit interested universities and colleges during midweek, during March and April, thus further missing class time in high school.

Number three, the student forfeits spring sports eligibility in high school to participate in these all-star games. Number four, the all-star games are primarily beneficial to private promoters. They become the agents, circulating around these games. Number five, the number all-star games participated in is a status symbol to the high school

student.

In reading some newspaper clippings, I notice that some young men have participated in as many as 20 games. Another young man said he missed 17 days of school in the last part of the school year and his grades obviously suffered. I think the next statement he made is most significant. "If I had to do it all over again," he said, "I would have limited my participation to only a few games."

Number six, they extend the recruiting period involved. Now, the problem is that these games are held while the student is still in high school but not enrolled in college. In other words, the high school doesn't want you to touch them and the colleges have been reluctant to touch them because they are not enrolled students. Nevertheless, our NCAA rules apply to students prior to college enrollment for two different areas: the professional amateur rules and for the limit of six initial visits to the college.

I will be the first to admit also we have further problems with college seniors participating in a number of games that are at the conclusion of their college education. But I think this forum can address that problem at another time. I notice we have a High School Federation Committee along with an NCAA Committee studying this problem and they came up with a recommendation, of which I would like to read just three lines.

The committee urges the support of high school administrators in discouraging participation in all-star games scheduled during the academic year and favors that competition be curtailed. I think the intent is excellent; but I don't think it will provide anything to solve the problem. We think it is a real problem and we urge the adoption of this proposal. I really would like to hear a lot of other discussion on it since we have never had any forum to this effect.

**Harry Fouke** (University of Houston): I speak to the Convention just as a member of one of the committees that Mr. Jacoby referred to. This was not a unanimous opinion relative to the approval or disapproval of this particular proposal. There was concern, however, registered among the membership as to whether or not it is appropriate that the NCAA involve itself in activities which are really within the purview of the high schools.

We are now moving into the area of the high school student's senior year and placing penalties upon the actions of students who are still in high school. We think that the proposal has an excellent objective, but there is a question as to whether or not this is the way to reach that objective. We are not, as a committee, recommending one way or the other, but we do think it is important for the Convention to recognize that we are moving into the high schools and in so doing there is question as to whether or not the NCAA should restrain its activities to those things which come under its normal years of competition rather than moving into the high schools. The high schools do have a way to correct this if they wish to do so.

They could do so through their normal academic procedures without moving the NCAA into an area which is questionable. I call that strictly to the attention or only to the attention of the Convention so

that there will be understanding as to the position of the high school committee.

**Charley Scott** (University of Alabama): I am a member of the Recruiting Committee of this Association. This item came up at a meeting of Recruiting Committee during the past year, and at that meeting I don't recall those that were present, but there were representatives from some high school organizations and it was discussed in considerable detail.

As I recall, it was not recommended by a committee. The primary reason was one which I will express personally. I just don't see how the NCAA could go into a high school and try to control attendance. I think that is a responsibility of the principals, the superintendents and the boards of education of those school systems.

[Proposal No. 84 (page A-50) was approved.]

### Summer Basketball

**Jim Jarrett** (Old Dominion University): I move proposal No. 85.

[The motion was seconded.]

**C. D. Henry** (Big Ten Conference): I wish to move proposal No. 86, an amendment to No. 85.

[The motion was seconded.]

I wish to speak in favor of the summer basketball proposal. Athletes play organized summer basketball from the seventh grade until they complete their first year in college. Then the source for future outside development dries up. In our conference we have athletes who live in affluent suburban areas who have come to the Big Ten office and tell us they get no chance to play basketball because they never see a person taller than 6-3, and then most of those want to use the country club.

However, those who are bold enough to venture down on the south side where everybody plays, including the Chicago Bulls, have their own organized teams. One particular young man didn't know if he would be eligible if he played on such a team, or if it would be considered "outside organized competition." So, we are speaking in favor of this amendment and proposal No. 85. They would sort of define what is already going on.

Now, we know the dangers that were experienced in the 1950s when we had the scandal in the Catskills. However, if you look at the rating sheets in basketball they identify people everywhere, so if the players were going to be reached by gamblers they could be reached anywhere. We would certainly urge support of this amendment that says such outside play would have to be within 100 miles of the student's official residence or within 100 miles of the institution the student-athlete attends.

**Mickey Holmes** (Missouri Valley Conference): I, too, would speak in support of the Big Ten amendment as well as proposal No. 85. I have had some negative experiences in this area and have spent a little time delving into the existing situation enough to know that there are many leagues and tournaments which exist primarily in the metropolitan centers and fall within the purview of this rule.

In fact, I think if effectively applied, if you put air in the basketballs from the end of your season until the following October 15, you have a very real potential for violation which would render any participant ineligible. I know a lot of players who have inadvertently placed themselves in the negative position, and yet the enforcement of this rule, and I don't think this is a gross exaggeration, in approximately 99 per cent of the cases is through individual institutional self-disclosure.

Thus, the honest players and honest institutions pay the penalty while others turn their back on it. This activity has so thoroughly permeated the sport that I think it is time to bring it above board. To me, this proposal does at least force institutional involvement and institutional awareness about a season's activities and provides much better control than the situation that exists now, because it would take institutional permission for involvement.

If gambling is the argument, and C. D. did touch on this, I think he is 100 per cent correct when he says that the gambling element has already identified the players and the players who might be susceptible, and this would not contribute to their getting any additional information to this type of activity.

Driving this above board, we feel, will provide greater institutional control and awareness, and not a greater number of problems. We urge your support of both the amendment and the general principle.

**Joe Vancisin** (National Association of Basketball Coaches): The basketball coaches feel since the purpose and objectives of this organization are to serve the best interest of the student-athlete and to promote broadly based sports programs at the colleges and universities and to emphasize the pursuit of athletic excellence, Constitution 3-9-(c) is contrary to these objectives. Therefore, we seek your support in this legislation.

[Proposal No. 86 (pages A-51-52) was approved.]

**Ed Markey** (St. Michael's College): For many years now we have approached this organization in trying to get similar legislation passed. The arguments always promoted against it was the fact that gamblers would get to these students under these conditions, and obviously have an adverse effect on them.

I think it is unreasonable to continue this line of thinking with the various scouting reports that are available to coaches, to think that they would not be available to the gamblers. In this legislation, we have considered provisions which indicate considerable control of participation. Also, soccer and baseball have comparable stipulations and are to provide the student with an opportunity to play during this time. Because it is supported by the NABC, I think that we should support completely this legislation.

[Proposal No. 85 (pages A-50-51) was approved.]

### Normal Progress

**Jack Larsen** (University of Southern California): On behalf of the Council and the Academic Testing and Requirements Committee, I move adoption of proposal No. 87.



[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 87 would establish as a recommended policy for guidance of member institutions in the conduct of their intercollegiate athletic programs, that each member institution and member conference publish the normal progress requirements for that institution and conference.

**President Thompson:** Jack, this is a recommended policy for institutions, it is not a feature of our constitution or bylaws.

**Mr. Larsen:** That is correct. It does not establish forcible legislation. It is a guidance proposition.

[Proposal No. 87 (page A-52) was approved.]

#### Eligibility—2,000 Rule

**Mr. Larsen:** Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Council and the Academic Testing Requirements Committee, I move for adoption of proposal No. 88.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 88 would establish the so-called "triple option" means for an entering freshman student-athlete or junior college transfer to qualify for participation in competition and in practice. The triple options are: a high school certified grade-point average at the end of the sixth, seventh or eighth semester of at least 2.250 certified by the high school itself; or a minimum ACT test score of 17, or a minimum SAT test score of 750. The Academic Testing and Requirements Committee in proposing this legislation, and the Council in endorsing it, believe this allows flexibility in establishing the eligibility of an entering freshman for competition and practice. At the same time, it raises the standard for the required high school GPA. The Convention last year instructed the committee to take a look at this matter. I urge the adoption of No. 88 on that basis.

**Alan Williams** (University of Virginia): As the mover of the motion last year which directed this legislation to be sent to the Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements, and as the chairman of the faculty section of the College Football Association, I would like to address the reason why we need this particular rule and why we need increased academic standards. We came to the 2,000 only by accident when we disposed of the 1,600. We did that at a time when we were making all kinds of substantial changes in colleges and universities' curriculums, many which turned out unfortunate in regard to our own students.

More particularly, we have set as kind of a national standard that what it takes to get an individual to get into college and what it takes to stay is a simple 2,000. Nevertheless, everyone knows this is simply not so. What we have found has been a very serious exploitation of the student, placing him or her in a very difficult position in terms of the ability to compete in intercollegiate athletics, and at the same time making adjustment to a college and university curriculum.

As a member of the College Football Association, certainly it is not one of those that has been a super power by any measure, but one of those like many of the members of that association, as was pointed out

yesterday. We joined that association because we were concerned about the academic standards.

The one unifying thing I found in Atlanta last spring was the feeling on the part of the football coaches, the athletic directors and the faculty that some change for a more definitive and more stringent requirement of participation in intercollegiate athletics in Division I was needed. We have moved toward a redivision and yesterday we heard a great deal of discussion, particularly when we came to an amendment, that there was a need on the part of those who are now included in Division I, I-A or I-AA, that they could override some rash action.

I would like to ask those, many of whom have been opposed to some academic restrictions, that they now extend to us the same consideration. There is very real meaning that is expressed by faculty after faculty and campus after campus that we do something about what is a real tragedy, maybe even a disgrace in academic circles today.

I also would urge perhaps as one of those who voted to accept the Ivy League recommendation that allowed a number of schools that otherwise would not have been included, or however we are going to do it, that they give very real consideration to what is a hard-felt need on the part of a number of institutions and whether or not there appears to be a specific problem that you can identify. I assure you there is one and I would like to call it to your attention—the problem that you might have had in the past that has been taken care of by this amendment. That is that we all know of students who did not meet the qualifications standard but who have subsequently come to our colleges and universities and done well.

This amendment takes care of that problem. It permits you to give a grant, if you think that student has potential. It permits that student to come. He cannot practice for the first year, but he can make himself eligible. You can do what we say that educational institutions are supposed to do, and that is to prepare young men and women for a successful academic career.

I think we will find that if we look very closely to what has happened to the 2,000 rule, is that we have either turned our back and ignored what is going on or we are creating a large number of students who cannot under any circumstances earn a degree who pass through and out of our universities, but they do not achieve their academic degree.

**Rev. John O'Malley** (Loyola University, Illinois): I have no problems and questions regarding the necessity for academic standards for our students or those that are entering their universities and colleges from high school. I have some problem, however, with the NCAA giving its blessings to an exam by SAT.

I am familiar with ACT. But with SAT all over the country dropping, and under attack from many areas as to its validity, I don't think we should go on record at this time without further discussion of the validity of the SAT score and accept it as a standard for participation by the student-athlete.

**Mr. Henry:** I am in somewhat of a dilemma before I start. Yesterday morning, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Calloway mentioned something about

religion to Father Joyce, and I am somewhat reluctant to bring race into the discussion. However, I did attend a religious forum last summer, and I heard the rabbi keep saying something about "let my people go."

Now, coming from Louisiana and Lafayette, where 94 percent of the people are Catholics, I never heard the priest say that. I do think this is somewhat apropos, however. The triple option that the Council has endorsed is not giving the black athlete a triple option.

I don't believe the majority of black athletes will achieve a score of 17 in the 2,000 rule, when the national mean is 19. I hold a letter here from the College Board stating that they have had a conference on bias and will have another one February 14-15 in Chicago. So I can agree with the earlier statement, when we talk about the SAT as a score, and hence the one option that the student had of getting in, that is 2,000, has suddenly risen to 2.25.

Anything that is in combination with either one of these standardized tests will tend to affect the black athlete. I would rather have a better athlete admitted with the chance of graduating rather than having a marginal athlete who is going to come in and get washed away. But if we have to have a marginal athlete, I, too, as Jesse Hill said, would rather see him enter at 2,000 unless we want to get somewhat serious about an academic floor and take the 1,600.

**Mr. Larsen:** Mr. Chairman, in reaction, in an attempt to compete with Mr. Henry and his question, I don't believe any test score is a valid measure of the ultimate, the degree of success of the university. However, it has been adopted by many of our member institutions which use the test score, and some vary on the admissibility. That is what we are talking about, is the admissibility with, in essence, a long range concept that the commencement will take place with the degree.

Also, Mr. Chairman, let us point out that those institutions which don't use the SAT or the ACT score can continue to use the high school-certified GPA for determining eligibility.

**Lionel Newsom** (Central State University): I do not have the gift of either of the gentlemen who spoke before me, but I would like to say that with reference to the Black Intelligence Test of Cultural Homogeneity (BITCH) and the SAT and others, it is true that we see a preponderance of black athletes across this country, but when we see graduation lines we see a scarcity of them.

So my argument here is for support of this. The BITCH test is not recognized by many. The SAT is recognized by most. Whether we admit we have cultural contradictions, we do have them. It is still going to be required of the black people in America to meet the same standards. If we are going to let them go to school with less, then we must expect less of them.

So I ask you to support this and see that they meet the standards so they march, too, across that line and not just make all-America, but become lawyers, doctors and teachers. I ask you to support this.

**Leo Miles** (Howard University): I think that the 2,000 rule is probably the best we have for the high school, because it is what the high school student has done for three years or four years, whatever it

has been. The addition of the ACT or the SAT opens up another avenue that was there before we had the 2,000 rule, which simply meant that certain outstanding student-athletes had our people to go in and take examinations for them.

They have a score and they enter in an institution. With the advent of the SAT, or that kind of thing, we have seen what has happened. The 2,000 on his high school transcript I think is a good procedure and I hope it continues. But those of you who are interested in education have the opportunity, after the students get into your school, if you will clearly plot their normal progress, to provide valuable assistance.

This is your opportunity to be concerned about education, that so many of us have alluded to this afternoon. Going back to the 1,600 rule, in my opinion, is a backward step. I hope we will defeat this and the one that follows, and keep the 2,000 rule that we have now.

**Dan Miller** (Indiana University): There is one point that has not been discussed very much. I just want to hold this up for each one to be sure they realize that the one facet of this particular legislation that worries me very much, aside from the fact that in the Big Ten we think the 1,600, having a blend as it does of requirements rather than either/or, does have a better predictability for graduation.

There is the problem that this particular legislation does not allow the nonqualifier to receive aid his first year. The arguments for this were given awhile ago, but I am not convinced. There is no basis, as I read it, to provide athletic aid for a student during his first year if he does not qualify. I find that very bothersome.

[Proposal No. 88 (pages A-52-53) was defeated.]

## 9. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES.

**Peter Elliott** (University of Miami): I move the report of the Committee on Committees be adopted by this body.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

## 10. RECOGNITION OF OUTGOING COUNCIL MEMBERS

**President Thompson:** At this point, I should like to ask the following gentlemen to come forward and stand in front of the podium: Hubert Heitman, Ross Smith, Harry Troxell, Ernest Casale, John Eiler, Bob Strimer, Herb Thompson.

I want these gentlemen to appear before you, because I want to say on behalf of the Council and on your behalf how much we have appreciated their services on the NCAA Council. They have served in an amazingly strong way, and I appreciate it personally. I want you to have an opportunity to express this to them.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation to the outgoing members of the NCAA Council at this time.]

## 11. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

**Edward Betz** (University of the Pacific): The Nominating Committee recommends renomination of J. Neils Thompson as president and the renomination of Edgar Sherman as secretary-treasurer.

For district vice-presidents, the committee recommends the follow-

ing: District 1—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut (Division I); District 3—Charley Scott, University of Alabama (Division I); District 5—James Frank, Lincoln University (Division II); District 7—Joseph R. Geraud, University of Wyoming (Division I).

For vice-presidents-at-large, the committee has nominated the following: John Chellman, Indiana University of Pa. (Division II, District 2); Chalmer Hixson, Wayne State University (Division II, District 4); Olav B. Kollevoll, Lafayette College (Division I, District 2); Edward W. Malan, Pomona-Pitzer Colleges (Division III, District 8); Arthur J. McAfee Jr., Morehouse College (Division III, District 3); James P. Sullivan, Boston State College (Division III, District 1).

I move the nomination of these persons.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[The convention was recessed at noon.]

## FINAL BUSINESS SESSION

Friday Afternoon, January 13, 1978

The session convened at 1:30 p.m., President J. Neils Thompson presiding.

### 12. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

**President Thompson:** Ladies and gentlemen, it is now 1:30. I should like to proceed with the session. I have some announcements to make first as to procedure, though. I want to advise you of the officers' recommendations for procedures for the remainder of the session in order to accomplish as much legislation as possible.

Our intention at this time is to continue to monitor our progress until 3 p.m. At 3 p.m. we will submit to you for your unanimous consideration an approach to legislation that, in our opinion, seems to be most important.

#### 2,000 Rule/1,600 Rule

**C. D. Henry** (Big Ten Conference): I would like to move proposal No. 89.

[The motion was seconded.]

I wish to speak to proposal No. 89 on behalf of the Big Ten Conference and the Advisory Commission of the Big Ten Conference. Both those groups urge support of this amendment. The Advisory Commission consisted of one black member from each of the Big Ten schools: Buddy Young, Illinois; George Talifero, Indiana; Deacon Davis, Iowa; Tom Dawes, Michigan; Horace Walker, Michigan State; Leo Trabert, Minnesota; Don Jackson, Northwestern; Robert Dorsey, Ohio State; Willie Jones, Purdue, and Charles Thomas, Wisconsin.

This group recommends and our conference emphasizes graduation. We feel the 1,600 legislation is the greatest predictor of graduations that we have. May I remind the Convention of the philosophy behind the 1,600 legislation. That is that the student-athlete is a typical male student on his university campus.

The university and conference may use the national table to determine if that student-athlete is typical. We are recommending this legislation to be the same as it was in 1972 when it was defeated. Some cite the several tables as a weakness. We do not feel they are a weakness of the system.

It might be a weakness of the conference procedure. But it is up to you to use the national table or to develop your own. To again emphasize graduation, the multiple regress equation that is used to predict the 1,600 may hinder some athletes at the point of entrance. But we believe that more athletes who are admitted will remain in school to be coached and to play four years and to graduate at the end of that time.

In our conference, again emphasizing graduation, we provide for a fifth year of education if our athletes follow our normal progress rule and need additional time. Although I am proud of that conference procedure, I feel a better student will eliminate most of the needed fifth-year help.

Much has been mentioned in the last two days about the Teddy winners. One former Teddy winner, Jerome H. Holland, then a member of the Council, led the fight to get the original 1.600 legislation adopted. We believe that we should follow the lead of this former Teddy winner and support this amendment. Thank you.

**Leo Miles** (Howard University): I rise to oppose this measure because I think, once again, it is a backward step in the study of some of the big conferences when they were having the 1.600 indicated that a number of their athletes did not graduate when they had the 1.600 system in then.

I don't know why they think they will graduate now with the new 1.600 system which would be the same 1.600 system that had been in existence prior to the 2.000 rule. Of course, we have already heard people indicate that the SAT is cultural, socially and otherwise biased. They refer to some other groups of former athletes from the Big Ten who were supporting this legislation.

There are a lot of other athletes from other institutions who found out that the 1.600 rule really was not a good measure. Again, I say it will open up divisive measures which existed some time ago, including people substituting for people in terms of taking this SAT test. I say right now we have a measure already in there for those who are interested in education, and that is after your student-athlete arrives at your institution see that he attends the proper classes; yet put the proper amount of hours so he can make satisfactory progress for his degree and at the end of the four years will be able to graduate.

**Jesse Hill** (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): I also rise to urge defeat of this legislation. In 1972-73, we all admitted there were many problems with the 1.600 legislation, primarily with the administration of it. Also, there were problems with the fact that there were various things going on relative to who would take the examinations. I urge the defeat of this proposal and that we maintain and retain the rules we have right now, the 2.000 legislation.

**Wayne Duke** (Big Ten Conference): Mr. President, I would recommend for reading of the membership the very excellent article in Sports Illustrated's football issue written by John Underwood, in which he cited two major problems facing intercollegiate athletics today. One is the matter of limitation on athletic grants and it is the topic of discussion of this particular Convention. Quite obviously, in my opinion, it is a singularly most important piece of legislation for preservation if not the salvation of college football in terms of achieving equality, sanity and economy. The second problem he cites is a lack of academic standards at NCAA member institutions, and the many problems inherent in the present 2.000 rule.

That is my opinion, the 2.000 rule is totally meaningless. Likewise, the triple option as well. Maybe the 1.600 prediction rule isn't the

answer. This happens to be my 28th NCAA Convention and in my opinion, it is one of the most important that I have ever attended. In terms of reorganization, it is very important. It is also important in terms of preserving the limitations on athletic grants which many people, those who are in Division I right now, have said are very important to the preservation of athletics. It is also important in retaining and restoring some credibility to academic standards in college athletics. I urge the adoption of the 1.600 rule at least as a means of obtaining some credibility of institutions which represent a great Association which I have had the honor of representing some 28 years.

[Proposal No. 89 (pages A-53-58) was defeated.]

**Frank Elliott** (Texas Tech University): Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which proposal No. 88 was defeated.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

### Seasons of Competition

**Cecil Coleman** (University of Illinois): Mr. President, I move No. 90.

[The motion was seconded.]

**President Thompson**: The motion has been made and seconded to the approval of No. 90, and it is now before you. There are two amendments which you must consider first.

**Marcus Plant** (University of Michigan): I wish to move adoption of No. 91.

[The motion was seconded.]

The effect of this amendment will be to change the date from the 19th birthday to the 20th birthday, and it is considered advisable to do this because at 19 the legislation, while it is not specifically directed at foreign athletes, does have a highly discriminatory effect against one group of foreign athletes, namely, Canadian athletes.

The practice in Canada in secondary schools of college-bound students taking a fifth year means that those students do not graduate at the same ages as the students in the United States. We went through with this in the Big Ten between 1955 and 1960, when we adopted a rule such as this, although that rule was directed specifically at foreign athletes, alien athletes, and we set the age at 19.

What happens with respect to the Canadian athletes, and this is including not only the hockey players but gymnasts, track men, swimmers, divers, is that they take their fifth year and undertake a season of competition. Sometime during that year, their 19th birthday arrives and they are faced then with the necessity of either abandoning competition for the rest of that year or continuing and losing a year of possible eligibility in an American college.

The decision by the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia, which struck down the Alien Athlete Rule as unconstitutional because it was discriminatory against the foreign athletes, would suggest that this rule with respect to a particular segment of foreign athletes may face a similar fate. Any discrimination, whether implicit or in fact against aliens, is, as the Supreme Court of the United States stated, inherently suspect and is subject to searching view.

That whole problem would be voided if the age is changed to 20. By that time the seniors in Canada have finished their work. If they are coming to American colleges, they would not have faced the effect of this provision. The movement of the one year, the increase of the age from 19 to 20, is not seriously impairing the policy of the legislation with which I am in agreement, but it still will prevent the so-called overage athlete from competing against our athletes. So I urge that this be amended by changing the portion that I have discussed.

[Proposal No. 91 (pages A-58-59) was approved.]

**Merle Loken** (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I move proposal No. 92, an amendment to No. 90.

[The motion was seconded.]

We request that you support No. 92, which removes the word "recruited" from proposal No. 90. Several of us have spoken earlier about problems associated with the term "recruitment." The removal of the word "recruited" prevents game playing. Let me give you an example.

If No. 90 passes without this amendment, it would be possible for a 30-year-old athlete to participate if he was not recruited. But if he were recruited, he could not participate.

[Proposal No. 92 (page A-59) was approved.]

**David Maggard** (University of California, Berkeley): I should like to speak in support of proposal No. 90, as amended. I believe this piece of legislation, as pointed out earlier, is obviously directed to the older alien student-athlete. I believe this legislation helps to eliminate possibly wide use of the older foreign athlete and also standardizes the age group of all student-athletes participating in our athletic program. I urge adoption of this proposal.

**Bruce Allison** (Colorado School of Mines): I have a question for the chair. What effect would this have upon youngsters going directly from high school into the military and competing in service games?

**President Thompson:** Prior to their college enrollment, if they participated on an organized team or any other established operation of that fact, it would then count.

**Frank Rienzo** (Georgetown University): A point of clarification. Based on that interpretation of the military teams, that would also apply to any organized teams—that would mean score kept, uniforms, officials, such as in church leagues?

**President Thompson:** The answer over here is yes.

**Corey VanFleet** (Oakland University): Have we had the benefit of counsel in regard to whether this is defensible in light of the HEW guidelines and regulations based on age, any age?

**President Thompson:** Let me say we have discussed this on a number of occasions with our legal counsel, and they have no problems with this proposal. That doesn't mean that there might not be some problems that occur in the future, but they have none at the present time. The NCAA Council did consult with the legal people in this regard.

**Thomas Niland** (LeMoyne College): I can't believe with all the problems we have with discriminatory actions that we want to enact another discriminatory action to eliminate somebody because he was born on a certain particular time. I believe we are making a grave error in trying to pass this legislation.

**Stephen Horn** (California State University, Long Beach): I completely agree with the last gentleman. When I look at my own university, the average age of the undergraduate body is 24. The average age of the graduating class is 26. In regard to what was said earlier this morning, we are in an era where students leave high school, work, marry, might come to school for one or two courses, save up enough money and then go full-time, and all of a sudden we are saying because you weren't the typical American in the 1930s and didn't get to college at age 17 we are ruling you out for opportunity of athletic participation. I think the proposal is really nonsense.

**Leo Miles** (Howard University): I have to get up here and make one comment about this proposal, because I have seen this in another form. I simply think this is just bad legislation. I think if we pass this we will be in a lot of trouble.

**Harry Cross** (University of Washington): In the first place, this proposal would standardize—with reasonable leeway for the delay aspect—the youngster who graduates by starting out in grade school as a six year old, and with the happiness of his birthday being in the summertime, graduates at 17.

His 18th year and 19th year, with our 20-year proposition, are accommodated, although the 19th year worries me.

Now, to talk about the proposition that somebody who lays out for awhile and then comes to our institution is somehow or other going to be penalized: Most of our youngsters come to our respective institutions about the same age level that we are talking about here—starting at age 20.

Further, if the youngster has to stay out for economic reasons, is he going to be engaged in organized practice? It seems we are still at the proposition that we ought to think not only about the youngster that Mr. Horn speaks about, whether he is being fairly treated, but about all the rest of the youngsters who are competing against him.

This is a reasonable process. Our alien rule proposal was struck down due to constitutional reasons. All this does is assure that our native students, as well as alien students, will be treated equally in competitive sets in all our institutions. We should support this enormously.

[Proposal No. 90 (page A-58) was defeated.]

[Proposal No. 93 (page A-59) was withdrawn.]

### Seasons of Competition

**Gene Sullivan** (DePaul University): I move proposal No. 94.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to prevent a situation whereby a player is eligible under the NCAA rule for regular-season play and ineligible for postseason play. Under Constitution 3-9-(a), an athlete has five



years to complete his four years of athletic eligibility.

This allows for injury, transfer adjustments and so forth. As I say, this will permit four years of eligibility for championship competition during his five eligible calendar years, with no restriction relating to his freshman year. However, under Bylaw 4-1-(d), if the athlete is hurt in the first year he would be eligible for postseason play in his fifth year.

We have rules whereby a player is eligible for regular-season play and ineligible for postseason play that are not logical, sensible or fair. To have more stringent eligibility requirements for bowl play is not fair. If freshmen were not eligible, the rule as currently constituted perhaps would make sense. But freshmen have been eligible for five years.

It is time we brought the five-year rule and the postseason eligibility rule into line. I have inquired of numerous officials, athletic directors and so forth, and I have found none who were personally in favor of different rules for postseason play. But the only concern expressed was that the change might lead to more red-shirting of freshmen.

Individuals who are going to take advantage of the five-year rule solely for athletic purposes, circumventing the spirit of the rule, are going to red-shirt the athlete as a sophomore or apply for a hardship waiver for his freshman year. Also, the grant limitations now in effect, 95 for football and 15 for basketball, restrict promiscuous red-shirting. I also say the present rule is not in effect a detriment to red-shirting because freshmen red-shirts can play 11 football games and 25 basketball games in their fifth years.

I believe Marcus Plant and Father Joyce indicated they are still concerned with freshman eligibility. Indeed, red-shirting might make more sense in the freshman year than any other time, but it is not the freshman red-shirt that suffers from the present rule. It is the walk-on or unrecruited athlete who did not compete as a freshman.

Why should those athletes be ineligible for postseason play if they legitimately participate in the fifth year? Postseason play is a reward, a successful season participation. In the years ahead with inflation and Title IX, there will be more walk-ons. Let's correct this inequity. Divisions II and III have made this adjustment. I urge you to support proposal No. 94.

**Richard Post** (San Jose State University): As the previous speaker has mentioned, Divisions II and III have already passed the amendment a year ago. This means that in any common championship, it is possible for a Division II and a Division III athlete to be in his fifth year and not have participated as a freshman, but it is not possible for a Division I athlete to participate in the same championship. I think there is an inequity involved here that should be amended.

**Dan Miller** (Indiana University): My concern and the reason I would oppose this legislation, Mr. President, is with the nonqualifying student as a freshman. The entering nonqualifier can wait out a year and then have four years of competition as I see it. I do not think it is proper.

[Proposal No. 94 (page A-59) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 95 (page A-60) became moot with the approval of No. 94.]

## Hardship—Ice Hockey

**Edward Krause** (University of Notre Dame): I propose adoption of No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to accord the sport of ice hockey a "hardship" requirement comparable to that in the sport of football. Hockey is a tough sport. With schedules of 36 games in most hockey programs, we think that this rule will certainly help.

[Proposal No. 96 (page A-60) was approved.]

[Proposals 97 and 98 (pages A-60-61) were withdrawn.]

## Individual Eligibility Changes

**Edward Betz** (University of the Pacific): Speaking for the Council, I move adoption of No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

I wish to point out that this method of determining eligibility between semesters is already provided for in inseason competition in all three divisions. Likewise, in Divisions II and III, the same procedure is followed. It would seem quite reasonable that Division I would follow this same procedure for postseason events. I urge the adoption of this resolution.

**Robert Steidel** (University of California, Berkeley): I would like to speak in opposition to the proposal. I oppose it for what it does. It changes a definite time for changing eligibility from the first day of classes on the following semester or quarter to an indefinite time, which is officially certified by the institution.

My problem is what is "officially certified"? I recognize this is probably transmitted to the registrar and the registrar puts his approval on it. That is "officially certified" and anyone can look at the transcript and see the grade is there. Then I am not too sure. "Officially certified" might also be when a letter can be persuaded out of an instructor.

At our institution we use post cards. That is, we recognize we can't get the grades out of the instructors in a short time. If there is a problem with a student, we ask him to submit a post card to the instructor and the instructor puts the grade down and when it comes through he can take that to the college office and the college office will then certify him eligible for enrollment for the following quarter. Is that "officially certified"? If that is, how about a telephone call, is that official certification?

I think this is too loose. I object to the looseness of the situation. I don't object to the fact that you are going to have something moved up from the next day of the following quarter so long as you state when it happens. I think we can live with it if a definite time. I think your faculty representatives should be very careful of it.

Mr. Betz' argument this is already done in Divisions II and III doesn't carry any weight with me at all. I think that I have seen over this last day and one-half that there are differences between universities. If anything comes across to me, it is that. Now, I think we can

accept the differences in the athletic programs in the universities, because there are differences in the registrar's office.

My registrar's office is a lot different than someone else's, I will guarantee you. We oppose this.

**Mickey Holmes** (Missouri Valley Conference): We had sponsored item No. 98 which we withdraw in favor of No. 99, since the basic final result is the same. This legislation, as stated, would allow a Division I institution to officially determine the eligibility status of a student-athlete between terms and effect that decision, whether the individual is eligible or ineligible. Then, again, I would remind the members of this Convention that the current provision is actually inconsistent with Constitution 3-3-(b) and (c) and Case No. 89.

I would speak more specifically to Case No. 89 because I think that is a little clearer. The question asked in this particular case is relative to when a student-athlete becomes academically eligible or ineligible between terms. The answer states that a student-athlete should become eligible or ineligible on the day he is officially certified eligible or ineligible by the appropriate institutional authority, but in any event not later than the first day of classes of the next regular term.

What that means is that for all sports, other than basketball, you are in a situation where you have the latitude between terms to establish the eligibility or ineligibility of the student-athlete. It can become effective at that particular time.

Whereas, in basketball, if you are a member of a conference that holds automatic qualification, with this inconsistency, that decision that your institution has made, cannot be made until the first day of classes. For that reason and because it does primarily affect one sport, therefore, creating an inconsistency for one sport in comparison with all others, we would urge you to vote in favor of No. 99.

[Proposal No. 99 was approved.]

#### Transfer Rule—Calendar Year

**Jack Davis** (Oregon State University): I move adoption of proposal No. 100.

[The motion was seconded.]

This Association has a good transfer rule, but there are some practical problems in applying the calendar requirement specifically for those institutions which have a late fall start. This proposal would allow for the change in the problem of applicability, so if a student does transfer to an institution in the fall, particularly the following year, if a football student, he still would be eligible on the first date of competition rather than have to sit out the two or three or four games that would occur if he were eligible only on the first day of classes.

This also would provide for the student who gets caught in the change of an institution's calendar. This would be consistent with what already exists in Divisions II and III, and I would hope it would be approved.

[Proposal No. 100 (page A-62) was approved.]

#### Transfer Rule—Calendar Year

**John Russell** (Wesleyan University): I think the intent here in No. 101 is clear. It is merely to bring into conformity the present interpretations of the transfer rule for Divisions II and III. I propose adoption of No. 101.

[The motion was seconded and proposal No. 101 (pages A-62-63) was approved.]

#### Transfer—Junior College

**Dan Miller** (Indiana University): I would like to move proposal No. 102.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 102 would require a qualifier or nonqualifier out of high school who first enters junior college to spend two years in residence at the junior college before he would be immediately eligible upon transfer to a member institution. Otherwise, he would be required to be in residence at the member institution for one academic year and wait one calendar year and transfer before being eligible.

We feel this involves two problems with Bylaw 4-1-(j)-(8) and (9). Any one of the many reputable community colleges who attract a qualifier out of high school may now see him recruited away from them by a four-year school if he does well.

In addition, it is arguable that the transfer after one year from a junior college should have to wait one year as a transfer from a four-year institution must. At the other extreme, however, the nonqualifier, a poor academic risk student, can at present seek a marginal junior college specializing in snap courses and inflated grades, secure the 2,500 and then be immediately eligible upon transfer to a member institution.

I cannot speak for other parts of the country, but in the Midwest we are seeing an increasing number of such cases. There are even a few junior colleges recruiting nationally for the nonqualifier. The first of these two situations involving the qualifier is unfair to our reputable institutions at the junior college level; in addition, the nonqualifier should not be enticed by the quick purge opportunity to enter a member institution if he has no chance to graduate.

Both of these situations could be avoided by passage of proposal No. 102.

**G. B. Wyness** (West Coast Athletic Conference): I wish to urge you to oppose this proposal. I urge that you not support this measure because it takes from the individual and his family, and the circumstances which may have caused him to attend a community college and places him there if he wishes to compete; and makes him pay a price that he should not have to pay. He has the privilege of choice and I urge the defeat of this proposal.

**Jack Davis** (Oregon State University): I would urge opposition, also. This has quite a negative connotation, this word "adopted." My institution advises a lot of students to start their academic career at a junior college. If this were adopted, I think that in a number of

instances the penalties are great enough that we might not urge a student to start at a junior college.

There are enough safeguards in the current rules with regard to that student that is academically deficient and we should keep it status quo.

**Richard Perry** (University of Southern California): I, too, would like to suggest we oppose this measure. Mr. Miller suggested the negatives of junior college choice. In our area, we find some very positive things. Where the youngster has been injured very severely and not been recruited, he should have the election to go to a junior college in close proximity to his home where he can afford that.

We then allow him the freedom of choice to be recruited and we believe that junior college to be his choice. I think it would be presumptuous for us to impose on the youngster a situation in which he might not be able to move at his discretion at any point in time in his career.

**Andrew Montana** (California State University, Fullerton): I would like to ask a question on this proposal. I believe that I oppose it. This legislation would penalize the athlete relative to other students. Now, I happen to be the athletic director but I am primarily, my major function is that of a chemistry professor.

Now, I have dealt with and advised pre-med students for approximately 20 years. Many of our good students start in the two-year college. But there is a pecking order in our system. I will admit the University of California is at the highest. We at the state colleges are in between. But the junior college, unfortunately or realistically, is at the lower end.

When a student goes to a professional school, it makes a difference where that student does his work. I can remember when one of the deans of admissions at one of the most respected medical schools in our state pointed that out. I recognize there are many good students in the state college and university system. But, to my knowledge, not any of them have been admitted to our school. Now, that kind of hurts. But I am interested in maximizing my students' opportunities to get into professional schools.

I have talked to many students, high school and junior college students, and I urged these students to get into the senior college as quickly as possible so that they can take their work in a senior college. I think that is imperative where a good group of students, and what this would do would tell the student-athlete, who is also interested in professional schools such as medicine or dentistry, you have to stay in the two-year college. I think that is unfair.

[Proposal No. 102 (page A-63) was defeated.]

#### Transfer Rules

**Robert Ray** (University of Iowa): I move adoption of proposal No. 103.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposition specifies that a student-athlete who leaves a four-year college to attend a junior college must complete one full year of enrollment and one calendar year of residence to be eligible at

another four-year institution, unless he returns to the institution in which he first enrolled.

The circumstances now exist where a student enters a four-year college, with so-called College A, and is there for a year-and-a-half, and it appears that he may not be eligible at the end of that two-year period; he can leave that institution after one-and-a-half years and go to a community college and become a graduate of that institution, having attended there only one semester.

This is a quick purge. We heard a good deal this morning about academic standards, and the adoption of this proposition would certainly show our intention regarding academic standards. Now, let's take another student that enrolled in Institution A, the four-year institution, and transferred to another four-year institution. He would be required to sit out the whole year in order to be eligible.

Why is it fair under those circumstances and why should the privilege then be allowed under the other circumstances to the student who may go to the quick purge arrangement? We urge your support of No. 103.

**Hubert Heitman** (University of California, Davis): I would like to point out with that one term of junior college, the junior college student has to sit out the rest of the year just because they have to be in residence at the junior college. It doesn't make academic sense for that student to continue in that junior college for any length of time if he has already taken all the work that it offers.

**John Martin** (Fisk University): Two years ago Fisk University, a Division III school, had a three-time world record holder stolen from the university and put into a junior college, where he stayed one semester and immediately became eligible to run that same year for another institution. I would urge that we do not change this regulation.

[Proposal No. 103 (pages A-63-64) was defeated.]

#### Academic Year Interpretation

**Robert Steidel** (University of California, Berkeley): I move adoption of No. 104.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this item is to determine the academic year and to confirm the requirements for that academic year of residency. You will note that I have used a different word than I have written in the book, and that is because under advice we want to change the word to define academic year to confirm the requirements of the academic year.

The purpose of this proposal is to move the definition out of the case book into the bylaws. On Pages 57, 58 and 59 and 60 of the Manual, you will find the term "residence" stated ten times.

Nowhere does it state what "residence" is. You will find out what "residence" is but you will have to go to the back of the book in the blue pages. I submit that my coaches at the University of California don't do that. Maybe your coaches do, but we have a different registrar's office and a different coaching staff there. I am not using this definition for those of you in this room.

I am saying I want people who are going to search out the meaning of "residence" to be able to find it where residency is stated. This is, in a







































































































































provided the opportunity to make additions or corrections. Copies of such reports are confidential and shall not be provided to individuals (or their institutions) who may be involved in reporting information during the processing of an infractions case.

"(10) The enforcement staff shall attempt to develop any information which would corroborate or refute alleged violations of NCAA legislation reported in previous interviews.

"(11) The enforcement staff shall terminate the investigation related to any preliminary inquiry in which information is developed which does not appear to be of sufficient substance or reliability to warrant an official inquiry, it being understood the enforcement staff shall report to the committee the reasons such a case is closed.

"(12) The committee may authorize an enforcement staff member to meet personally with the chief executive officer of the involved institution to discuss the allegations investigated and information developed by the NCAA in a case which has been terminated.

"(13) The enforcement staff shall attempt to coordinate the processing of infractions cases with the involved allied member conference unless it would hinder the development of the NCAA investigation to do so.

"(14) Subsequent to the filing of an official inquiry in an infractions case, the primary investigator in the case shall be available to assist the involved institution for purposes such as meeting with the institution to discuss the development of its response and assisting in locating various principals in the case.

"(15) The enforcement staff shall not confirm or deny the existence of an infractions case prior to complete resolution of the case through normal NCAA enforcement procedures. However, if the involved institution makes a public announcement concerning a case, the enforcement staff may confirm the information made public by the institution.

"(b) Letters of Official Inquiry—The enforcement staff shall report to the committee the general scope of the matters under investigation in order to obtain authorization to file a letter of official inquiry with the involved institution.

"(1) In the interim between meetings of the full committee, the chairman may authorize the filing of such inquiries.

"(2) In the event the representative of a member institution refuses to submit relevant information to the committee or the enforcement staff upon request, the committee may authorize an official inquiry to be filed with the institution alleging a violation of the cooperative principles of the NCAA bylaws and enforcement procedure; further, institutional representatives may be

requested to appear before the committee at the time the allegation is considered.

"(3) At the time an official inquiry is filed, the enforcement staff shall suggest a date and time for the involved institution's representatives to meet with the committee.

"(i) If an objection to this suggestion is expressed by the institution, the chairman (or the full committee, when necessary) shall be contacted to resolve the matter.

"(ii) Although every effort will be made to schedule a meeting at a mutually convenient time and place, the committee reserves the right to determine the actual date and site.

"(4) The cover letter accompanying each official inquiry shall contain notification that the institution is requested to:

"(i) Read each allegation involving a present or former institutional staff member, or a currently enrolled student-athlete, to the identified individual, and

"(ii) Provide him the opportunity to submit in writing and orally any information he desires which is relevant to the allegation in question.

"(iii) In addition, the institution shall be advised that each identified present or former institutional staff member, or enrolled student-athlete, should be notified in person, as well as in writing, by the institution that he and his legal counsel (if any) may appear before the committee at the time it considers each allegation in which the staff member or student-athlete is involved.

"(5) The cover letter accompanying each official inquiry shall contain a specific reference to Section 4 (which describes the general procedures to be followed during a hearing), as well as notice in extensive cases that the primary NCAA investigator in the case is available to assist the institution in the development of its response to the official inquiry.

"(6) The institution's response to the committee's official inquiry should be on file with members of the committee and the NCAA enforcement department at least two weeks prior to the institution's appearance before the committee. An institution may not submit additional documentary evidence (in addition to its initial response) without prior authorization from the committee.

"(c) Institutional Hearings—The following procedures shall apply to institutional hearings.

"(1) When the Committee on Infractions does not request that an institution be represented in person

before the committee, the institution may choose to have the matter in question reviewed on the basis of the written record before the committee.

"(2) An institution shall be advised in writing prior to its appearance before the committee of the general procedures to be followed during the hearing. Such notification shall contain a specific reference to Section 4 and shall indicate that, as a general rule, the discussion during the hearing will follow the numbering of the allegations in the official inquiry.

"(3) In cases requiring an institutional hearing before the committee, specific information and evidence developed by the staff related to alleged violations of NCAA regulations shall not be presented to the committee prior to the institution's appearance.

"(4) A member of the committee or the NCAA Council who is prohibited under the provisions of Section 11 from participating in any NCAA proceedings may not attend a Committee on Infractions hearing involving his institution unless specifically requested by the committee to be present as a witness.

"(5) At the time the institution appears before the committee, its representatives may include the following:

"(i) Currently enrolled student-athletes involved in allegations;

"(ii) Present or former institutional staff members involved in allegations;

"(iii) Legal counsel for the student-athletes or staff members in question, and

"(iv) Officials of the institution and the institution's legal counsel.

"(v) None of these individuals who appear before the committee may be represented by an individual other than his personal legal counsel, and no other individuals may be included among the institution's representatives during an institutional hearing unless specifically requested to be present by the committee.

"(6) Institutional officials, staff members or enrolled student-athletes who are specifically requested to appear before the committee at an institutional hearing are expected to appear in person and may be represented by personal legal counsel. Any student-athlete (and his legal counsel) included among the institution's representatives may attend the hearing only during the discussion of the allegations in which he is involved.

"(7) The commissioner or other representative of an allied conference's executive office may attend an institutional hearing involving a conference member, subject to approval of the involved institution.

"(8) The chairman shall request each institution appearing before the committee to select one person to coordinate institutional responses during the hearing. In addition, one individual from the NCAA enforcement department will be responsible for coordinating the responses of the investigative staff.

"(9) The enforcement staff shall prepare a worksheet listing all allegations and applicable NCAA regulations in infractions cases to assist committee members in following discussion of each allegation during the hearing. At the time of the hearing, the institution will be provided copies of the allegation worksheet; and if any variation exists between the statement of allegations in the official inquiry and the worksheet, the allegations contained in the official inquiry shall be controlling.

"(10) The proceedings of institutional hearings shall be tape-recorded by the committee. No additional verbatim recording of these proceedings will be permitted by the committee. An institution shall not be provided the committee's recording or a copy of the transcript of the hearing. However, subject to approval of the committee, authorized representatives of the institution may be permitted to review the tape recording at the NCAA national office, it being understood a verbatim transcript of the recording shall not be taken by institutional representatives during such a review.

"(11) In presenting information and evidence for consideration by the committee during an institutional hearing, the enforcement staff shall present only information which can be attributed to individuals who are willing to be identified. Information obtained from individuals not wishing to be identified shall not be presented. Such confidential sources shall not be identified to either the Committee on Infractions or the institution.

"(12) At the conclusion of the hearing, the institutional representatives and the NCAA enforcement staff will be dismissed in order that the committee may deliberate in private to determine findings of violations and penalties to be imposed, if any.

"(13) In arriving at its determinations, the committee may request additional information from any appropriate source, including the institution or the investigative staff.

"(d) Confidential Reports—The following procedures shall apply to confidential reports.

"(1) Subsequent to an institutional hearing, the enforcement staff shall be authorized to draft the committee's confidential report of the findings of violations and penalties determined by the committee. Further, the staff shall be authorized to draft the committee's expanded confidential report to the NCAA Council upon



appeal of any of the committee's findings or penalties. The confidential reports shall reflect accurately the committee's actions and the reasons therefor and are subject to the approval of the chairman (and, if necessary, the full committee).

"(2) The committee's confidential report (as described in Section 5) shall be forwarded to the involved institution under the chairman's signature or under the signature of a committee member selected to act for the chairman. Further, the report shall be sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, in order that the 15-day appeal period applicable to this report may be firmly established.

"(3) In the event an institution appeals any of the Committee on Infractions' findings of violations or penalties to the NCAA Council, a copy of the committee's expanded confidential report to the Council (as described in Section 6) shall be provided the institution prior to the time of its appearance before the Council.

"(e) Penalties—The following procedures shall apply to penalties.

"(1) Once the committee has made its findings of violations in an infractions case but prior to its determination of the penalties to be imposed, information may be obtained from the enforcement staff concerning penalties imposed in previous cases involving findings similar in number and significance.

"(2) In the event the committee imposes a penalty involving a probationary period, the institution shall be notified that after the penalty becomes effective, the NCAA investigative staff will review the athletic policies and practices of the institution prior to action by the committee to restore the institution to full rights and privileges of membership in the Association; further, the institution shall be notified that should any of the penalties in the case be set aside for any reason other than by appropriate action of the Association, the penalties shall be reconsidered by the NCAA.

"(3) In the event the committee considers additional penalties to be imposed upon an institution in accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 7-(b)-(12), the involved institution shall be provided the opportunity to appear before the committee; further, the institution will be provided the opportunity to appeal any additional penalties imposed by the committee to the NCAA Council.

"(f) Press Releases—The enforcement staff shall draft the committee's press release related to an infractions case involving a public penalty.

"(1) The press release shall reflect accurately the committee's thinking and shall be subject to the ap-

proval of the chairman (and, if necessary, the full committee). Further, the most serious and significant findings of violations of NCAA legislation shall appear at the beginning of the summary of violations in the release.

"(2) The committee's public announcement related to an infractions case shall be made available to the national wire services and other media outlets. In this regard, the involved institution shall be advised of the text of the announcement prior to its release and shall be requested not to comment publicly concerning the case prior to the time the NCAA's public announcement is released."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To include in the official enforcement procedure reference to the Committee on Infractions' responsibility to formulate operating policies, procedures and guidelines, and to include those in the official procedure.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended by No. 161-1.

#### NO. 161-1 ENFORCEMENT POLICIES

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Proposal No. 161-B; Enforcement Procedure 12, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 12. The following is a statement of operating guidelines, policies and procedures established by the Committee on Infractions and approved by the NCAA Council. These procedures are subject to continual review and possible change by the committee; and to the extent that they are revised, appropriate notification is sent to any member institution involved in the processing of an infractions case and made available to any other member; further, such revisions shall be reviewed by the membership during the following annual Convention."

[All remaining paragraphs unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved.

#### NO. 162 RESOLUTION: DISASTERS

[All divisions, common vote]

"Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council be directed to conduct a study of the Association's constitution and bylaws to identify any portions thereof which could place an unnecessary burden on a member institution involved in a disaster which terminates its athletic program in a sport; further, that the Council sponsor legislation at the 73rd NCAA Convention to establish waiver opportunities in such situations as it deems appropriate."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved.

## Appendix B

### 72nd Annual Convention

#### REVISIONS OF EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS

[The Association's Executive Committee is empowered by the constitution to adopt executive regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of the constitution or the bylaws. Following are the revisions of the executive regulations as adopted by the Executive Committee during 1977. Those letters and words which have been deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which have been added appear in **bold face**. Page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1977-78 NCAA Manual. This is the final year that the revised regulations will be printed in the Convention publications. Beginning in 1978, they will be printed in the NCAA News throughout the year in the same manner as interpretations.]

##### A. GAMES COMMITTEES

**Executive Regulations:** Regulation 2, Section 1-(b), page 100, has been amended as follows:

"(b) The games committee shall include the director of athletics of the host institution, or his designated representative, and the chairman of the governing sports committee, or the chairman of the appropriate divisional subcommittee of the governing sports committee, who shall serve as chairman. The chairman of the governing sports committee may appoint as many additional persons to the games committee as he deems necessary, **provided that a majority of the members of the games committee shall meet the requirements of Bylaw 10-1-(a)-O.I. 1000.**"

**Source:** NCAA Executive Committee.

**Intent:** To specify that a majority of the members of a games committee are regular staff members at an NCAA member institution.

##### B. INSTITUTIONAL BANDS

**Executive Regulations:** Regulation 2, Section 1-(j), page 101, has been amended as follows:

"(j) Admission shall be charged at all NCAA championships. Ticket prices shall be determined by the respective games committees with the approval of the governing sports committee. All noncompeting students and faculty members shall be charged regular admission prices, except that cheerleaders in uniform, not to exceed 12 in number, may be admitted without charge. **Band members in uniform (not to exceed 25 in number) may be admitted without charge if recommended by the governing sports committee and approved by the Executive Committee, except that there shall be no limitation in the Divisions II and III Football Championships unless the respective**

**divisional football committees establish limits.** Ticket prices may be 'scaled' according to the location of the seats."

**Source:** NCAA Executive Committee.

**Intent:** To permit a specified number of band members in uniform to be admitted to NCAA championships without charge.

##### C. STUDENT TICKETS

**Executive Regulations:** Regulation 2, Section 1-(j), page 101, has been amended as follows:

"(j) Admission shall be charged at all NCAA championships. Ticket prices shall be determined by the respective games committees with the approval of the governing sports committee. *All noncompeting students and Faculty members shall be charged regular admission prices, except that Cheerleaders in uniform, not to exceed 12 in number, may be admitted without charge. Noncompeting students of a participating institution, or the host institution, may purchase admission tickets at a reduced rate to be recommended by the governing sports committee and approved by the Executive Committee.* Ticket prices may be 'scaled' according to the location of the seats."

**Source:** NCAA Executive Committee.

**Intent:** To provide for reduced ticket prices to students from the participating and host institutions.

##### D. INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

**Executive Regulations:** Regulation 2, Section 4-(b), page 104, has been amended as follows:

"(b) To be eligible to enter teams or individual student-athletes in NCAA meets or tournaments, an institution must meet the following criteria by the dates of September 30 for fall championships, December 1 for winter championships and March 1 for spring championships:

[Subparagraphs (1), (2), (3) and (4) unchanged.]

"(5) Have confirmed **annually** its sponsorship of a varsity intercollegiate team in the sport by so reporting on the NCAA official information form. [Constitution 4-2-(a)-O.I. 12 defines a varsity intercollegiate sport.]"

**Source:** NCAA Executive Committee.

**Intent:** To require institutions to certify annually their sponsorship of sports.

##### E. AWARDS

**Executive Regulations:** Regulation 2, Section 6-(e), page 106, has been amended as follows:

"(e) The invoice for producing awards for *the all National Collegiate (Division I) Championships* shall be forwarded to the *meet or tournament executive director* for payment, and the cost shall be entered as an item of game expense for the championship paid from

the appropriate divisional reserve fund. The cost of producing Division II and Division III awards, other than in the sports of football and basketball, shall be paid from the appropriate divisional reserve fund. Payment for awards in Division II and Division III Football and Basketball Championships shall be made from tournament receipts."

**Source:** NCAA Executive Committee.

**Intent:** To absorb the cost of awards for NCAA championships into the Association's general operating budget.

#### F. COMPLIMENTARY TICKETS

**Executive Regulations:** Regulation 2, Section 7-(c), page 107, has been amended as follows:

"(1) All tickets shall be accounted for at face value and shall become a part of gross receipts, *except for such complimentary tickets as are authorized by the governing sports committee and approved by the Executive Committee at the time the budget for the championship is approved.* Working passes may be provided to bona fide working personnel, including media representatives; and participation passes may be provided to student-athletes competing in the meet or tournament, as well as their coaches, athletic trainers, managers and other members of the participating institution's official party as defined by the Association.

"(3) *Active member coaches from NCAA member institutions who also are members in good standing of the affiliated coaches association of the sport involved may be entitled to one complimentary ticket to the finals of the meet or tournament.*"

**Source:** NCAA Executive Committee.

**Intent:** To eliminate complimentary tickets at all NCAA championships.

#### G. SUNDAY COMPETITION

**Executive Regulations:** Regulation 2, Section 12-(c), page 111, has been amended as follows:

"(c) NCAA championship competition *shall not* may be scheduled or conducted on Sunday, *except as provided herein provided the governing sports committee has received the prior approval of the Executive Committee.*

"(1) If an emergency develops which causes postponement of an NCAA championship, or if the competitive situation dictates a more expeditious completion of the meet or tournament, Sunday competition may be permitted, provided the competing institutions are agreeable and advance approval is obtained from the NCAA officers.

"(2) *Competition in the Association's baseball, soccer and tennis championships may be scheduled on Sunday; however, If a participating institution has a policy against Sunday competition, the tournament schedule shall be adjusted to accommodate that institution; and such adjustment shall not*

require its team or an individual competitor to play prior to the time originally scheduled.

"(3) *Games in the Division II Lacrosse Championship may be rescheduled on Sunday to avoid conflicts with games in the National Collegiate (Division I) Lacrosse Championship, but only if the competing institutions agree.*

"(4) (3) Whenever NCAA competition is conducted on Sunday, it may not begin prior to noon, local time."

"(4) *In individual championships, an athlete must compete according to his institution's policy regarding Sunday competition; i.e., if the institution has no policy against Sunday competition, the athlete must compete on Sunday if required by the schedule.*"

"(5) *An institution which has a policy against Sunday competition must inform the games committee prior to the beginning of the meet or tournament in order for it or one of its student-athletes to be excused from competing on Sunday.*"

**Source:** NCAA Executive Committee.

**Intent:** To permit NCAA competition to be conducted on Sunday in all sports; to specify conditions under which an individual competitor may be excused from Sunday competition and to require an institution to inform the games committee in advance of its policy against Sunday competition.

#### H. COMMITTEE EXPENSES

**Executive Regulations:** Regulation 3, Section 1-(c)-(2) and (3), page 114, has been amended as follows:

"(2) If a committee member travels via automobile, he may claim 12 15 cents per mile round trip, but in any case the amount shall not exceed first-class airline fare.

"(3) A per diem allowance of \$40 \$50 may be claimed for each day, or part thereof, away from home, except that no more than one day's travel each way may be claimed; further, only one-half day's allowance may be claimed for the day of departure from the meeting site."

**Source:** NCAA Executive Committee.

**Intent:** To increase the expense allowance for members of NCAA committees as indicated.

## Appendix C

### Division I Football Roll-Call Vote On Subparagraph 3 of Proposal 27-A

The vote by districts:

District	Yes	No
1	1	5
2	6	8
3	24	13
4	9	14*
5	8	6
6	10	12
7	9	2
8	8	7
Allied	7	6
	82	73

\*there was one abstention.

The vote by members of allied conferences, not including the conference's own vote:

Atlantic Coast	6-1
Big Eight	8-0
Big Ten	8-1*
Ivy Group	0-8
Mid-American	0-10
Missouri Valley	0-7
Pacific Coast	1-5
Pacific-8	6-2
Southeastern	10-0
Southern	0-7
Southland	0-6
Southwest	9-0
Western	7-1

\*one abstention.

#### YES

**District 1**  
Boston College

**District 2**  
Penn State  
Pittsburgh  
Syracuse  
U.S. Military Academy  
U.S. Naval Academy  
West Virginia

**District 3**  
Alabama  
Auburn

Clemson  
Duke  
East Carolina  
Florida  
Florida State  
Georgia  
Georgia Tech  
Kentucky  
Louisiana State  
Maryland-College Park  
Memphis State  
Miami (Fla.)  
Mississippi  
Mississippi State  
North Carolina State  
South Carolina  
Tennessee-Knoxville  
Tulane  
Vanderbilt  
Virginia  
Virginia Tech  
Wake Forest

**District 4**  
Illinois  
Indiana  
Iowa  
Michigan  
Michigan State  
Minnesota-Twin Cities  
Notre Dame  
Purdue  
Wisconsin-Madison

**District 5**  
Colorado  
Iowa State  
Kansas  
Kansas State  
Missouri  
Nebraska  
Oklahoma  
Oklahoma State

**District 6**  
Arkansas  
Baylor  
Houston  
North Texas State

Rice  
Southern Methodist  
Texas-Austin  
Texas A&M  
Texas Christian  
Texas Tech

**District 7**  
Arizona  
Arizona State  
Brigham Young  
Colorado State  
Idaho  
New Mexico  
U.S. Air Force  
Academy  
Utah  
Wyoming

**District 8**  
California-Berkeley  
UCLA  
Hawaii  
Oregon State  
Southern California  
Washington  
Washington State  
San Diego State

**Allied**  
Atlantic Coast  
Conference  
Big Eight Conference  
Big Ten Conference  
Pacific-8 Conference  
Southeastern  
Conference  
Southwest Athletic  
Conference  
Western Athletic  
Conference

#### NO

**District 1**  
Brown  
Dartmouth  
Holy Cross  
Harvard  
Yale

**District 2**  
Colgate  
Columbia  
Cornell  
Pennsylvania  
Princeton  
Rutgers  
Temple  
Villanova

**District 3**  
Appalachian State  
Citadel  
Furman  
Louisville  
Marshall  
North Carolina  
Richmond  
Southern Mississippi  
Tennessee-  
Chattanooga  
Tennessee State  
Virginia Military  
Western Carolina  
William and Mary

**District 4**  
Ball State  
Bowling Green State  
Central Michigan  
Cincinnati  
Eastern Michigan  
Illinois State  
Indiana State-Terre  
Haute

Kent State  
Miami (Ohio)  
Northern Illinois  
Northwestern  
Ohio  
Toledo  
Western Michigan

**District 5**  
Drake  
New Mexico State  
Southern Illinois  
Tulsa  
West Texas State  
Wichita State

**District 6**  
Alcorn State  
Arkansas State  
Grambling State  
Jackson State  
Lamar  
Louisiana Tech  
McNeese State  
Northeast Louisiana  
Northwestern  
Louisiana  
Southern-Baton  
Rouge  
Southwestern  
Louisiana  
Texas-Arlington

**District 7**  
Texas-El Paso  
Utah State

**District 8**  
Fresno State  
California State-  
Fullerton  
California State-  
Long Beach  
Oregon  
Pacific  
San Jose State  
Stanford

**Allied**  
Ivy Group  
Mid-American  
Conference  
Missouri Valley  
Conference  
Pacific Coast Athletic  
Association  
Southern Conference  
Southland Conference

#### ABSTENTIONS

**District 4**  
Ohio State

## **Appendix D**

### **72nd Annual Convention**

#### **Nominating Committee**

Chairman—Edward S. Betz

District 1—Andrew T. Mooradian, University of New Hampshire  
District 2—Raymond J. Whispell, Muhlenberg College  
District 3—John W. Sawyer, Wake Forest University  
District 4—Fred Picard, Ohio University  
District 5—Don Leahy, University of Nebraska, Omaha  
District 6—Kenneth W. Herrick, Texas Christian University  
District 7—Lavon McDonald, University of New Mexico  
District 8—Edward S. Betz, University of the Pacific  
At-Large—Karl Kurth Jr., Trinity College (Conn.)  
At-Large—Edwin W. Lawrence, Cheyney State College  
At-Large—James E. Hawkins, Fort Valley State College  
At-Large—Paul F. Dietzel, Indiana University

#### **Committee on Committees**

Chairman—Peter R. Elliott

District 1—Harold S. Westerman, University of Maine, Orono  
District 2—John M. Tulley, Elizabethtown College  
District 3—Howard Davis, Tuskegee Institute  
District 4—George S. King Jr., Purdue University  
District 5—Bernard F. Cooper, University of South Dakota  
District 6—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville  
District 7—Richard W. Burns, University of Texas, El Paso  
District 8—E. John Larsen, University of Southern California  
At-Large—Gordon M. Brewer, Hope College  
At-Large—Harry Pure, Philadelphia College of Textiles & Science  
At-Large—Rocco J. Carzo, Tufts University  
At-Large—Peter R. Elliott, University of Miami

#### **Committee on Voting**

Chairman—Col. Philip J. Erdle

District 1—Robert W. Pritchard, Worcester Polytechnic Institute  
District 2—Daniel T. Mullin, State Univ. of New York, Geneseo  
District 3—Mandell Glicksberg, University of Florida  
District 4—C. D. Henry, Big Ten Conference  
District 5—Keith Colson, New Mexico State University  
District 6—John W. Hook, Pan American University  
District 7—Milton C. Mecham, Weber State College  
District 8—John W. Hermann, California State University, Los Angeles  
At-Large—Col. Philip J. Erdle, U.S. Air Force Academy

#### **Committee on Memorial Resolutions**

Chairman—Jack C. Patterson

Earl Banks, Morgan State University

Arthur C. Nicolai, Nebraska Wesleyan University  
Jack C. Patterson, Baylor University

#### **Committee on Credentials**

Chairman—John W. Sawyer

T. H. Anderson, University of Northern Arizona  
John V. Glinski, State University of New York, Oswego  
John W. Sawyer, Wake Forest University

#### **Parliamentarian**

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

#### **Chairman of Business Sessions**

J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin

#### **Chairman of General Round Table**

Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College

## Appendix E

### Past and Future NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1980

		(Hotels in parentheses.)
38th	1944	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (Saint Francis)
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973	Chicago (Palmer House)
1st Special	1973	Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974	San Francisco (Saint Francis)
69th	1975	Washington (Sheraton-Park)
2nd Special	1975	Chicago (Palmer House)
3rd Special	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
70th	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
71st	1977	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau)
72nd	1978	Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza)

NOTE: Prior to 1974, the annual Convention was held in December. No meeting was held in 1943, and commencing with 1944 the Convention has been held in January. The 1st and 2nd special Conventions were held in August. The 3rd special Convention was held immediately prior to the 70th Convention in January.

### 1979 Convention

Hotel St. Francis, San Francisco, California, January 8-10

### 1980 Convention

Hyatt Regency, New Orleans, Louisiana, January 8-10

## Appendix F

## Past and Present Officers of the NCAA

*President*

1906-1913 Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy  
1914-1916 LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University  
1917-1929 Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy  
1930-1932 Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University  
1933-1937 Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference  
1938-1940 William B. Owens, Stanford University  
1941-1944 Phillip O. Badger, New York University  
1945-1946 Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming  
1947-1949 Karl E. Leib, University of Iowa  
1950-1952 Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California  
1953-1954 Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama  
1955-1956 Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College  
1957-1958 Frank N. Gardner, Drake University  
1959-1960 Herbert J. Dorricott, Western Colorado State College  
1961-1962 Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University  
1963-1964 Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa  
1965-1966 Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University  
1967-1968 Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan  
1969-1970 Harry M. Cross, University of Washington  
1971-1972 Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee  
1973-1974 Alan J. Chapman, Rice University  
1975-1976 John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University  
1977- J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin

*Secretary-Treasurer*

- 1906-1908 Louis A. Bevier, Jr., Rutgers University
- \*1908 William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia
- 1909-1939 Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
- 1940-1944 Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
- 1945-1951 Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference
- 1952-1954 Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska
- 1955-1956 Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
- 1957-1958 Edwin D. Mouzon, Jr., Southern Methodist University
- 1959-1960 Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
- 1961-1962 Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
- 1963-1964 Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
- 1965-1966 Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
- 1967-1968 Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
- 1969-1970 William J. Flynn, Boston College
- 1971-1972 Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, District of Columbia Teachers College
- 1973-1974 Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
- 1975-1976 Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
- 1977- Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College

\*Bevier served as secretary, Lambeth as treasurer, in 1908.

[illegible]

Demco No. 82-0549



NATL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOC



1NCAA00003093S

